NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
3 0109 00005 4935

BR
121
F3

DATE DUE

Subject To Recall After 2 Weeks

LIBRARY

NORTH DAKOTA

STATE UNIVERSITY

FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA

DEMCO

WITHDRAWN

STUDIES
IN RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

THE CHURCH:
IN IDEA AND IN HISTORY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

STUDIES
IN
RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

THE CHURCH:
IN IDEA AND IN HISTORY

BY

A. M. FAIRBAIRN, M.A.,

LATE PRINCIPAL OF MANSFIELD COLLEGE,
D.D. . . . EDINBURGH, YALE, WALES, MANCHESTER, GÖTTINGEN,
D.LITT. . . . OXON AND LEEDS,
LL.D. . . . ABERDEEN,
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY,
F.R.S.L., F.R.S.A., F.N.A.

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1910

All rights reserved

147480

N. D. S. U. LIBRARY
FARGO, N. D.

Copyright, 1910,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped. Published February, 1910.

BR
121
F3

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

TO

THE OLD MANSFIELD MEN,

AS WELL AS THE MULTITUDES, WHO, WHILE IN OXFORD,

WORSHIPPED IN OUR COLLEGE CHAPEL

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED

PASS ON THE WORD.

As fiery cross from clan to clan
Passed swift and sure from man to man,
Pass on the Word!

The Word from ages past received,
The Word that ages past believed,
Pass on the Word!

The Word that tells of duty clear,
The Word that tells of death so near,
Pass on the Word!

In London slum, in opium den,
On mountain side, on sea, or fen
When fortune's wheel turns high, turns low,
In sickness' ebb, in life's full flow,
Pass on the Word!

Take up the message, pass it on
To others as life's course is run,
Run straight, run sure, and never cast
The call aside, while life shall last,
Pass on the Word!

E. L. C.

PREFACE

"STUDIES" is to me an old and familiar friend in the title of a book. I remember submitting a question, directly suggested by a first literary project, to a Professor, who later became Principal, in a northern university. viz. :—"What name would he give to a book made up of *scientific* attempts to conceive and represent formulated ideas, not, indeed, according to their place in a system, but in the isolation which was independence?" Without hesitation the answer came back: "would call it 'Studies.'" And when years later a kindred question was submitted, a kindred answer was returned. The name was not intended to qualify the ideas interpreted but the attempt at their interpretation; and was equal to essay[1] in the old sense, better represented by assay than by any other modern term. This does not denote "a written composition shorter and less elaborate than a treatise," but simply an attempt to examine the ideas by their interpretation. And this is the meaning which is attached to the word "Studies."

This book may seem too dogmatic to be fitly characterized by so undogmatic a name. Though I confess that its basis is formed by a collection of scattered papers, yet it has become a treatise on the church. It is held, indeed, that the change has improved the volume, without essentially

[1] The sense is better represented by "Assay" than "Essay," which may be compared with the Latin "exagium," the old French "Essai," and Italian "Assaggio."

changing its character, for it expresses the ideas to which the Mansfield pulpit is dedicated. The two addresses from the Chair of the Congregational Union may be said to deal, respectively, with the church in the first and in the nineteenth century. The paper read at Hanley covers certain points left out in the earlier discussions. The fourth paper, here printed as three, was in its original form an introduction to a jubilee volume, published by the Congregational Union, where it appeared as a discussion of Ecclesiastical Polity and the Religion of Christ. It was not intended here to change the papers, but to put in the notes any changes in the argument made necessary by later discussions and discoveries. This was abandoned, being found impossible of fulfilment.

There is also embodied in the volume "Studies" in the New Testament idea of the church, preceded by one on its main function or worship. This is followed by others on its founders and its making. These are succeeded by others on the teaching of Jesus as the standard of the church's living. In the second of these is embodied a discussion of what Jesus intended His church to be; and in a third an account of His passion as its foundation. There follow six chapters, three of which are occupied with Paul and three with John, the apostles being taken as specimens of the material Jesus used in building up His church.

I have, for the rest, to confess my obligations to Mr. P. E. Mathison of New College, who has most patiently read and wisely amended much that was faulty in the style, and to my colleague in Mansfield, Mr. T. M. Watt, M.A., who has prepared the table of contents and drawn up the index.

The poem which is published on page vi. has been sent to me by a friend.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

PAGE

I. THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN THE FIRST CENTURY 3–46

I

1. The inexhaustible significance of Christ shown in the multitude of churches 3
2. A Free church may be national, but not established . . 4
3. The triumph of the Spirit of Christ hindered by the disloyalty of the churches to His law 5

II

1. The normative character of the first century for Christian life and thought; the fascination of Christ for the following centuries 7
2. The ministry of Christ set problems whose grandeur was but dimly disclosed to the apostles 9
3. The revolution effected in the religious outlook of humanity by the life and teaching of Jesus—The creative years of the religion, 30 to 90 A.D. 10

III

1. Jesus and Paul—The central place of Christ in the Pauline Christology 13
2. The universalism of Christianity 15
3. Christianity denied the sufficiency of the old religions; its denials were based on a splendid positivism . . 17

IV

PAGE

1. The grandeur of Christ's aims and the seeming inadequacy of the men He chose to carry on His work . . . 19
2. In Paul the culture of the Græco-Roman world mingles with the intense religious convictions of the Hebrew race 22

V

1. The Gospel the Apostles preached: the place held by the Cross 24
2. "The doctrine of the Cross," though abhorrent to both Jew and Greek, yet the kernel of the Christian message . . 27
3. The Cross stood as the symbol and manifestation in time of the eternal love and sacrifice of God 28
4. The response in human life and faith to the altered conception of God—The freedom of His sons 29

VI

1. The circumstances of the age in which Christianity appeared: its deliverance from the limitations of the Jewish faith 32
2. The political condition—The unity of the Roman Empire —The rights of Roman citizens 32
3. The ancient moral ideals viewed in relation to the moral life of the first century 34
4. Its attitude to religion; religion socially useful, though impotent as a moral guide—Gibbon quoted . . . 36

VII

1. The heroic task essayed by the early church in its conflict with the Roman Empire 39
2. The change effected in man's conception of the universe and of God 42
3. The consequent moral and social changes 43
4. The secret of their success; the supreme doctrine was the doctrine of the Cross 44

II. THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY . . . . . PAGE 47–108

I

1. The churches and the ideal of Jesus 47
2. The good and the evil inherited by the churches from the past 48
3. The progressive nature of the divine ideal in the churches . 49
4. The responsibility of the churches; critical attitude of the modern mind towards traditional beliefs 49

II

1. The aim of the address—to consider the relation of the Christian Religion to our age 50
2. Religion defined: signifies the action of God—Works in all the churches 51

III

1. The gradual triumph of the Christian faith in the centuries following the apostolic age 52
2. The religion of Christ greater than any single ecclesiastical institution—The moral and spiritual ideals of the City of God not fulfilled in a political society like the Roman church, however great its services to religion may otherwise be 55
3. The revolt of reason and conscience against the political and sacerdotal ideal of the church: liberty as the true atmosphere for a personal faith 58
4. The effort of rationalism to construct a natural religion as the "truth" of historical religions 60
5. The continued progress of man depends on the increasing power of his religion—Christian ideal meets and harmonizes with the ideal immanent in the race . . . 61

IV

1. Christianity a living faith for the men of to-day . . 64
2. Its problems to-day more complex and radical than ever . 66

V

THE ATTITUDE OF THE AGE TO CHRISTIANITY.

PAGE

1. The religious spirit of to-day active, philanthropic, missionary 67
2. The modern spirit of philanthropy illustrated and contrasted with the ethical spirit of the age of Tacitus . . . 68

VI

THE IDEAL OF CHRISTIANITY

1. The attitude of the intellectual classes of our day to the Christian religion—Agnosticism—Æstheticism . . 72
2. Yet Christianity has ever claimed the finest intellects, and the eighteenth century can set Leibniz, Butler, and Kant over against sceptical Voltaire. Sadness accompanies loss of faith—e.g. Matthew Arnold 74
3. The attitude of the industrial and labouring classes to religion—Their estrangement from the churches . . . 77

VII

WHAT SHOULD BE THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCHES TO THESE TENDENCIES?

1. The modern intellectual movement may be called a heathen revival—The terms of its thought naturalistic . . . 79
2. Lucretius and the modern naturalistic thinkers compared—Their theory of the origin of the universe and of religion 82
3. The thought most opposed to Christianity is ancient—philosophical decadence—Renan and Matthew Arnold represent in modern times the critical spirit of Celsus . . 84
4. Christian elements in the modern intellect—The struggle towards a religious interpretation of the world—Reverence and humanity of the modern mind . . . 86

VIII

1. The conflict of views as regards religion—The appeal to pietism ignores the character of the problem—Religion as the admiration of the Altogether Good . . . 88
2. The view of nature and man as construed by science . . 90
3. The Christian conception of nature and man . . . 92

IX

RELIGION AND THE INDUSTRIAL CLASSES

PAGE

1. Estrangement of these classes owing to lack of interest in the churches for their welfare—The churches need to translate the principles of Christ into the creation of a new order 95
2. Christianity seeks to create good social conditions for all men—Its attitude to capital and labour 97
3. This plea urged upon the church as its duty in doing the will of Christ 99

X

THE DUTIES AND IDEALS OF THE CHURCHES

1. The responsibility of the churches to Christ . . . 100
2. The church that best interprets the religion of Christ will secure for it the most victorious life 101
3. Established churches contrasted with Free . . . 102
4. Free churches must have a positive note in their creeds . 104
5. The spiritual ancestry of the Christian minister . . . 106

III. THE SACERDOTAL AND THE PURITAN IDEA 109–141

The opposed conceptions of the church reduced to two: the Sacerdotal and the Puritan 109

I

1. The Congregational polity an outcome of its spiritual principle 111
   (i) Independency, though far from triumphant in the seventeenth century, was rich in great men and great ideas 111
   (ii) Political liberty affords opportunity for the exercise of spiritual principles 114
2. The Evangelical revival and English religious thought—The Anglo-Catholic movement 116

II

THE NEW PURITANISM AND THE NEW SACERDOTALISM

PAGE

1. Differences between Episcopacy and Independency more fundamental than those expressed in their relationship to the State 118
2. The Anglican church is essentially sacerdotal 119
3. Sacerdotalism, as exemplified in the Anglican church; its polity and its clerical orders held to be of divine origin; the episcopate "necessary not merely to its *bene esse*, but to its *esse*" 122

III

1. Such a system viewed as interpreting the mind of our Lord 123
2. Justice must be done, however, to the spirit and inspiration of the New Sacerdotalism 124

IV

1. The aim of both movements—the new Sacerdotalism and the new Puritanism — the same, the reconciliation of men to God through Jesus Christ 125
2. But Sacerdotalism (*a*) limits the universality of Divine Grace, (*b*) and conditions the grace of God on imperfect men; "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man" 126

V

1. Sacerdotalism magnifies the church, Puritanism magnifies God 128
2. The channels of God's grace as infinite as His ways . . 129
3. The conditions of approach spiritual and ethical, not sensuous and formal 131

VI

1. We must endeavour to present Christianity in Christ's way:
   (i) The Christian Society a brotherhood which knew no priesthood 132
   (ii) Its ideal: the churches related to the kingdom as means to an end 134
2. The chief figures in the early church—Paul's apostleship due to the direct vocation of God 135

VII

PAGE

1. The priesthood of all believers 137
2. Loyalty to a church may be disloyalty to God . . . 139
3. Congregationalism must awaken to a sense of its large mission 140

IV. ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY AND THE RELIGION OF CHRIST 142–175

I

1. The ideal of the Congregational polity sketched . . 142
2. The terms Congregational and Independent: the N. T. term ἐκκλησία 144
3. The independence claimed from external control; the Congregational principle of the sole authority of Christ—Independency means freedom 147

II

Ecclesiastical polities may be (1) Autocratic, (2) Episcopal, (3) Presbyterian, (4) Communal 151
1. The autocracy may be (α) civil, as in the Russo-Greek Church, or (β) ecclesiastical, as in the Roman Catholic Church 151
2. Episcopacy as illustrated in the Roman and the Anglican Churches 151
3. The Presbyterian polity—Milton at first a Presbyterian; later an Independent 152
4. The "Communal" polity to be further treated of . . 155

III

1. The polity of a church must be judged by the religion in its purest form, or its ability to realize the ends for which the religion stands 155
2. Church polities either Monarchical or Republican . . 156

IV

1. The contrast of catholicism with the Christianity of Christ —His "priesthood" in the Epistle to the Hebrews . 157
2. The Primitive church neither sacerdotal nor organized into a single body politic 161

V

PAGE

1. English scholars on the question of the episcopate in the apostolic age—Hatch's Bampton Lectures and Lightfoot's Essay on *The Christian Ministry* 162
2. The divine right of episcopacy and historical criticism . 168

VI

1. (α) The moral ideal in Judaism is social, and is intended for man as man : (β) the ceremonial law is limited to a class, the priesthood 170
2. (γ) Jesus Himself is the new law for the Christian ; (δ) love of Him the new motive for its fulfilment 173
3. Christian ethics neither legal nor ascetic, but social . . 174

V. HOW THE RELIGION OF CHRIST GREW INTO CATHOLICISM 176–204

I

1. The evidence from Clement of Rome as to the place of "bishops" at Rome and Corinth 176
2. In the epistles of Ignatius the bishop is the symbol of order, and in the Clementine homilies he is the depository of theological truth. Both these tendencies unite in Irenæus 178

II

1. The emphasis of the Ignatian epistles compared with that in the Pauline letters 180
2. In the Clementine literature we have the Ebionitic version of the apostolic history 181

III

1. Development of Episcopacy more rapid in the East than in the West 183
2. The gradual hardening of the distinction between κλῆρος and λαός 186
3. The influence both of Judaism and of Greek religion in the growth of sacerdotal ideas in the church . . . 187

IV

PAGE
1. Tertullian and Cyprian cited as bearing witness to the change 189
2. The supremacy of Rome passed to the church . . . 194

V

1. Is a polity an adequate vehicle of the religion? . . . 195
2. The evolution of the sacerdotal polity affected the church as the vehicle and exponent of Christ—
(α) In doctrine.
(β) In ethics.
(γ) In the polities of the religion . . 198–201

VI

1. The sacerdotal revolution divorced sacrifice from life . . 201
2. The evolution of the sacerdotal polity depraved the social ideal of Christ 202

I. HOW SECTS HAVE COME OUT OF AN ATTEMPT TO REVIVE THE RELIGION OF CHRIST . . 205–241

I

THE REFORMATION AS AN ATTEMPT TO RECOVER PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

1. The Reformation in Geneva and in England contrasted . 205
2. The rise of the Puritans and Separatists in England . . 207
(i) The Puritans believed in the religious functions of the State 208
(ii) The Puritan differed from the Separatist; the power of the civil magistrate in religious matters . . 209
3. The differences between Puritan and Anglican as regards—
(α) Polity.
(β) Ministry
(γ) Moral integrity of the church 211

II

1. The idea of the church to the Separatist 212
2. Apostolic polity and Apostolic religion 214
Notes—A. Robert Browne and his system . . . 216
B. Brownism as opposed to Puritanism . . 217
3. The Congregational ideal and the Anglican compared—The Anglican ideal in Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* . . 222

III

PAGE

1. Independency: its appeal to the conscience and reason . 227
2. Its attitude towards the State 228
3. It denied the lordship of the magistrate over the conscience —Toleration a religious necessity 231

IV

1. The magistrate not to meddle in matters of conscience, because Christ is the King and Law-giver—The attitude of the Fathers shared by the founders of Independency . 233
2. Toleration in England, a creation of Independency—Bacon, Chillingworth, Jeremy Taylor, Locke cited in defence of Toleration 235

PART II

INTRODUCTORY 245–252

I

CHRIST IN THE CHURCH AND IN HISTORY

1. The true attitude towards the N. T. writers . . . 246
2. Interpretation and criticism of the N. T.—The effort of interpretation justified 247

II

1. Classes of Criticism: (α) Literary, (β) Historical, (γ) Religious, (δ) Doctrinal—Distinction of doctrine and dogma . 249
2. Criticism, as applied to the N. T., brings out religious significance of the Book 251

I. WORSHIP 253–282

I

THE WORSHIP OF GOD AMONG THE JEWS; THE EIGHTY-FOURTH PSALM

1. The Psalm interpreted: true in idea of the aged David . 254
2. The interpretation emphasizes (i) the emotions which possess the man, and (ii) the object toward which they are directed 256

II

PAGE
1. The Temple differs from the Christian church . . . 258
2. Religion and Art 259
3. The Christian congregation an epitome of mankind . . 261

III

1. The reciprocal action of God and man needful to true worship 264
2. The "living God" of Christian worship 264
3. Man as a worshipping being 266
4. "Worldliness," as lack of sense of the Eternal Presence, which worship gives 268

IV

1. Praise and Prayer, as personal and collective . . . 270
2. Praise an essential element in worship 271
3. Public prayer must be congregational 273

V

1. God's response to human needs 275
2. The place of the sermon in the worship of God . . . 276
3. Preaching and its historical place 277
4. The influence of the pulpit in Scotch history . . . 279
5. The meaning of "minister" 281

II. JESUS AND THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH 283–305

I

1. Jesus Christ: His obscurity and silence 283
2. The distinction between disciples and apostles . . . 285
3. The ministry of Jesus opens full of buoyancy and hope . 286
4. The period of Apostolic education and the Jerusalem ministry 287

II

PAGE

1. Why were the disciples of Jesus drawn from the poor and unlettered? 288
2. No priest became a disciple of Jesus 289
3. The high vocation of the priesthood in the history of Israel 290
4. Priesthood in the time of Jesus 291
5. The irreconcilability of priesthood and apostleship . . 291

III

1. Contrast between the Sadducees and the Scribes and Pharisees 293
2. The Pharisees as interpreters of the Jewish sacred writings 293
3. Jesus and the Pharisees; the publicans and sinners . . . 295

IV

1. The sort of men Jesus attracted to Himself . . . 296
2. He shapes the ideals and purposes of the peasants who followed Him 297
3. Types of disciples: account of the Apostles . . . 299

V

1. The character of Peter, disciple and apostle . . . 301
2. The John of the Synoptists 302
3. The Apostles were filled with an enthusiasm for humanity . 304

III. THE MAKING OF THE CHURCH . . . 306–321

I

1. Jesus in Galilee: Pharisaism 306
2. The Pharisaic notion of the Law 307

II

1. The initial condition of discipleship 308
2. Jesus and His contemporaries 308
3. Galilee as the scene of Jesus' early ministry . . . 310

III

1. Jesus and His relations to the synagogue 312
2. Jesus honoured by the people, and shuns the scholasticism of the Synagogue 314

IV

PAGE
1. The independent attitude, adopted by Jesus, towards Rabbinic tradition; illustrations 315
2. His attitude towards the Sabbath, fasting, etc. . . . 317

V

1. Jesus embodies His teaching in His daily conduct . . 318
2. The ideal of Jesus 319
3. The teaching of Jesus, and its success 321

IV. THE TEACHING OF JESUS IN ITS FIRST PERIOD 322–370

I

1. The Sermon on the Mount: two versions, Matthew's and Luke's 322
2. The Sermon on the Mount an answer to the questions that Jesus' preaching and presence prompted 324
3. The Sermon consists of several "sessions"; these outlined, and their questions 325

II

THE FIRST SESSION

1. The Beatitudes express the ideal of the perfect man . . 326
2. Jesus does not seek to analyse what happiness is . . 327
3. He seeks to make good States by means of good men . 328
(i) Interpretation of "The Poor in Spirit" . . . 328
(ii) Of the mourners 330
(iii) Of the meek 331
(iv) Of the love of righteousness 332
(v) Of the merciful 333
(vi) Of the pure in heart 334
(vii) Of the peacemakers 334
(viii) Of the persecuted 335
4. Beatitudes end with three reasons for consolation addressed to the persecuted 335

III

THE SECOND SESSION

1. The disciples as (i) preservative, and (ii) illuminative . 336–8
2. Jesus defends Himself from the charge of being a revolutionary 338
3. Jesus declares the principle of revolution through evolution 339

IV

THE THIRD SESSION

PAGE

THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS 341

1. The sovereignty of God supersedes the Law . . . 341
2. The righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees . . . 342
3. Those "called great in the Kingdom of Heaven" . . 343
4. (i) Jesus and the Religion of Israel 344
   (ii) The inwardness of the higher righteousness . . . 345
5. The ethics of Jesus rooted in Theology 346

V

THE FOURTH SESSION—THE KINGDOM

1. The invisibility of the things God most values . . . 347
2. A (1) Philanthropy the creation of Jesus 348
   (2) Almsgiving among the Jews 349
   (3) The true spirit in almsgiving 350
   B (1) Almsgiving and prayer as "righteousness" or "worship of God" 351
   (2) "Lord, teach us to pray" 352
   (3) The first part of the Lord's Prayer; the things of God 353
   (4) The second part of the Lord's Prayer: the distinction between "sins" and "debts" 354
   C (1) Fasting as a religious practice 357
   (2) Jesus as the Bridegroom 357

VI

THE FIFTH SESSION—THE KINGDOM

1. The righteousness of God; righteousness with Matthew and Paul 359
2. Interpretation of "mammon-worship" 361
3. Autobiographical touches in the words of Jesus . . . 363
4. The lessons Jesus draws from Nature 365

VII

SIXTH SESSION—THE KINGDOM AND ITS DUTIES

1. Jesus answers suppressed or unrecorded questions . . 367
2. Sympathy which must become conviction: the epilogue . 369

V. THE TEACHING OF JESUS IN HIS MIDDLE PERIOD—THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH . . 371–431

I

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS IN HIS MIDDLE PERIOD (α) AS REGARDS "MATTER," (β) AS REGARDS "FORM"

1. The education of the Apostles: Peter's confession . . 373
2. Confronted with disaster, Jesus sought to found His church 374
3. The vision of the future church 376

II

1. The interpretation of "Thou art Peter": the term "Peter" official, not personal 377
2. Interpretation of "on this 'Petra' (rock) will I build My church" 378
3. Peter as the sort of man the church is to be built of . . 379
4. Peter and the claims of Rome 380

III

1. Christ's idea of the church.
   (i) The only reference to the church universal in the teaching of Jesus.
   (ii) Difficulties as to meaning of ἐκκλησία.
   (iii) Agreement sometimes apparent, while differences are real.
   (iv) Difficulties may arise from fact that while Jesus spoke and taught in Aramaic, the Gospels are written in Greek 382
2. The Hebrew and Greek antecedents of the Biblical term "church" 384
3. The meanings of the term "church" in the New Testament 385
4. The idea, though not the term, the church starts with Christ 387

IV

1. The problem of the translation of the term ἐκκλησία . . 389
2. The English word "church" not a satisfactory rendering of ἐκκλησία 390
3. The associations of κυριακόν, from which it is derived, hang around the term "church" and its representative in cognate tongues 390

V

PAGE

1. Christ as Foundation, Architect, and Builder of the church 392
2. Its constituent elements: the Saviour and the saved . . 393

VI

1. Christ compared with Buddha, Confucius, and Plato . . 393
2. Christ no dreamer of literary ideals 396
3. The creative work of Christ, as expressed in the institutions of mercy to-day 397
4. London as typical of modern life—The good and the bad elements in its life—The Christian conscience . . 399

VII

1. The method of Jesus in founding His church . . . 400
2. The personal can alone heal the personal—The Incarnation 401

VIII

1. The true meaning of apostolic descent 403
2. Types of the men moulded by the Spirit of Christ: Tertullian and Origen, St. Augustine and Pelagius, Dante and Thomas à Kempis, Luther and Erasmus . . . 405

IX

THE CHURCH INVISIBLE

1. Christ the Central Force in all historical churches . . 410
2. The magnanimity of Christ 413

X

1. Christ is the absolute Sovereign in His own church: a sovereignty not resting on physical force 414
2. The church ought to be the Incarnation of Christ as regards its functions: those of priest, prophet, and king . . 415

XI A

1. The priesthood of the church is undelegable . . . 416
2. The ministry must be personal and not official . . . 417

B

1. The prophetic office of the church 418
2. The practical and speculative problems to be faced by the church 419
3. The church must deal honestly with thought . . . 421

C

PAGE
1. The church can govern only by submitting to be governed 421
2. Christ's freedom both internal and external 422

XII

1. The coercive forces which have interfered with the church's freedom—Monarchy 423
2. The attempts of Labour and Capital to command the church 425
3. The danger to the church from (i) Æstheticism, and (ii) Athleticism 426

XIII

THE ACTS OF CHRIST'S WHICH ARE ALSO THE CHURCH'S

1. Christ as Head reigns through the church, which is His Body 428
2. The church, as Heir of God, the incarnation of Christ . 429
3. The church continues the redeeming work of Christ . . 430
4. The immortal life of the church 431
5. The church as Judge 431

VI. THE TEACHING OF JESUS IN ITS THIRD PERIOD: THE DEATH 432–468

I

1. Differences of teaching in this period 432
2. Jerusalem, and not Galilee, the scene of the ministry: contrasts 433
(i) The views of Nature 433
(ii) Differences between the two places . . . 434
3. Galilee the home of a mixed race—Judæa the centre of Judaism 435

II

1. (i) The development of Jesus 437
(ii) His early environment in Nazareth 437
2. The questions at issue between Jew and Galilean—
(i) The Pharisees and the Sadducees, and their different spheres of influence 438
(ii) The Synagogue and the Temple, and their different claims 440

III

PAGE

1. In Jerusalem, new opposing forces to be faced by Jesus . 441
2. The place of "apocalyptic" in the later teaching of Jesus . 442
3. The character of apocalyptic literature 443
4. (i) The later teaching of Jesus is concerned with the future in an unusual degree 445
   (ii) And chiefly with the mystery of His death . . 445

THE DEATH OF JESUS

IV

1. Calvary a mirror of the eternal strife of God with sin . . 445
2. The agony of Gethsemane: its meaning 446
3. The attitude of the priests and rulers to Jesus . . . 448

V

1. The Passion and Sacrifice of Jesus 449
2. The ironical conduct of the priests 450
3. The shame of the Cross transmuted by the grace and love of Christ 451

VI

1. The Cross as fact and allegory 453
   (i) The Cross as universal 453
   (ii) The Cross is heaviest for the blameless . . . 454
2. Why did the Holy Son of God suffer?
   (α) Suffering the instrument of God's love . . . 455
   (β) The suffering of the innocent is remedial suffering for the guilty 456
   (γ) Sin gives more pain to the good than to the evil . 456
3. (i) In the Cross men see sin with a divine eye . . . 456
   (ii) The power of the Cross does not diminish with the lapse of time 457

VII

1. The two robbers crucified with Jesus 458
2. The birth of the malefactors and the birth of Jesus . . 459
3. Their characters as revealed on the Cross 461

VIII

PAGE
1. The impenitent hard towards sin 462
2. The penitent thief 463
3. The character of Jesus as elucidated by contrast with the lives of the two malefactors 465

IX

1. The consciousness of Jesus on the Cross 465
2. Evil as manifested in the impenitent 467
3. And in the penitent thief 468

VII. PAUL THE APOSTLE OF JESUS CHRIST . 469–502

I

1. "Accidental" and "essential" differences of character . 469
2. The qualities, called "accidental," which distinguish Paul alike from Jesus and apostles 470
3. The "essential" qualities which belong to Jesus as distinguished from Paul and the older apostles . . . 471

II

1. The call of Paul 474
2. The continuity of his spiritual development 475
3. The part played by (i) descent and (ii) environment in the education of Paul 476
4. The composite character of the people of Tarsus . . 477

III

1. Characteristics of the thought and speech of Paul: contrast with the speech of Jesus 478
2. The Jew and the Greek in Tarsus 481
3. The Jew and the complex culture of the Roman world . 482
4. Paul on the eve of starting for Jerusalem to study the law . 483

IV

1. The disillusionment of Paul in Jerusalem 484
2. The death and resurrection of Jesus and the Jews . . 485
3. Paul and Gamaliel 486
4. Paul's persecution of the Christians 487
5. His conversion on the way to Damascus 488

V

PAGE

1. The lesson of the retreat into Arabia 489
2. Paul and the apostles in Jerusalem 490
3. What Paul learned on his return to Tarsus 492
4. The discovery of Paul by Barnabas 494

VI

1. Jew and Greek join in making an apostle 495
2. Paul turns to the Gentiles.
   (i) Christianity emerges from Judaism 496
   (ii) The philanthropy of the early church 497
   (iii) The missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas . 497
   (iv) The question of circumcision in the church . . 498
3. The law of caste violated by a common meal 499
4. The distinctive Pauline doctrine enunciated in the Epistle to the Galatians: man is not justified by law, but by faith 500

VIII. PAUL IN EUROPE 503–544

I

1. The separation of Barnabas from Paul 503
2. The characters of Paul and Barnabas as manifested in this crisis 504
3. Paul's mission to Europe—The supreme event in history . 506
4. An "external" view of Paul and his mission 506

II

1. The joint mission of Paul and Silas 507
2. Their missionary journey 508
3. The religious associations of Asia Minor 509
4. The call of the civilized world to the Christian apostle . 510

III

1. The monotheism of Israel, as modified by Christianity . 512
2. Paul was, though a convert from Judaism, yet not an apostate 513
3. The Jewish hatred that followed Paul 514

IV

1. The characteristics of the author of the Acts 516
2. His attitude towards the Jews of Asia 518

V

PAGE
1. Paul and Barnabas at Lystra 519
2. Paul's journeys in Asia Minor 520
(Note on the Epistle to the Galatians, 521–524)

VI

1. The attitude of Paul towards the Gentiles; and the moral superiority of the Jew to the Greek 525
2. The significance of the Greek to the Jew 527
3. Paul in Europe: his speech at Athens 529

VII

1. Paul in Corinth—Gallio's attitude to religion . . . 533
2. The writings and writers of the N.T. 535
3. The Pauline letters, and their characteristics . . . 536

VIII

1. The value of the Pauline epistles 537
2. Paul makes Christianity literary 538
3. His characteristics as revealed in his epistles; their place in the N.T. canon 539
4. The emotional quality of the epistles 541
5. The epistles discuss particular facts in the light of general principles—The influence of Athens on Paul . . . 542

IX. PAUL IN ASIA AND IN PRISON . . 545–576

I

1. Paul's later missionary journeys. Apollos in Ephesus and Corinth 545
2. The growth of Paul's mind 546
(Note on the contents of 1 Corinthians, 547–551)

II

1. Exorcism in Ephesus 552
2. The religion Paul encountered in Ephesus 553
3. Paul's arraignment in the theatre at Ephesus . . . 554

III

1. The 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians: its contents . . 556
2. The date and contents of the Epistle to the Romans . . 557

IV

PAGE
1 & 2. The contents of the Epistle to the Romans, chaps. i-viii . 559

V

1. The contents of Romans: God's action in history, chaps. ix-xi 564
2. Romans, chaps. xii-xv. Ethical section of the Epistle . . 565

VI

1. Did Gallio read Romans? 566
2. Paul's egotism of vocation 569

VII

1. Paul's return to Jerusalem 570
2. Paul's meeting with James at Jerusalem 572
3. Paul's conflict with the Jewish spirit at Jerusalem. The epistles written during his imprisonment. The end . 575

X. JOHN THE APOSTLE 577–591

I

1. John and Paul 577
2. Paul's self-revelation in his letters 578
3. John in his epistles and gospel 579

II

1. John and Peter 579
2. The religious experience of John 580

III

1. John as friend and interpreter of Jesus 581
2. What the friendship of John meant to Jesus . . . 582
3. The theology of John, and his interpretation of Jesus . . 583

IV

1. The characteristics of Jesus in John's gospel . . . 585
2. John's mystical theology, and its influence on Christian thought 587

V

PAGE
1. Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel 588
2. The connection of the Gospel and the Apocalypse . . 589
3. John's apocalyptic vision of the church 590

XI. JOHN THE APOSTLE 592–609

I

1. The relation of the prologue to the history in the Fourth Gospel 592
2. The prologue of John and the genealogies of Matthew and Luke 593
3. The birth-stories of Matthew and Luke 594
4. John's view of Christ 594

II

1 & 2. The value of the Logos-doctrine for John's conception of God and Christ 596

III

IDEAS IN THE PROLOGUE

1. The true knowledge of God 598
2. Sonship and Fatherhood 600
3. Christ, the visible manifestation of the Father . . . 601

IV

1 & 2. Jesus comforts His disciples 602–605
3. Belief not easy for them in view of His coming death . 605

V

1. The sensuous scepticism of Thomas 606
2. Philip's question, as the question of collective man . . 608

XII. JOHN THE APOSTLE 610–628

I

1. Man's need of God 610
2. The autobiography of Mill 611
3. His religious beliefs 612

II

PAGE

1. God must represent man's highest idea 613
2. Thought not a product of organized brain 614
3. Neither in man, nor in an ape 615
4. A restatement of the test case: "Mind the Father of all things" 615

III

1. The moral consciousness of man, a witness to God . . 617
2. God must be absolutely holy 618
3. The witness of the heart: God is love 619

IV

1. Revelation, the response of God to the need of man . . 621
2. Jesus Christ as the personal revelation of God to man—God as Sovereign and Father 623

V

1. Sovereignty and Fatherhood 625
2. Their unity in the Christian conception of God . . . 626
3. The Christian doctrine of salvation 627

INDEX 629

STUDIES
IN RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

THE CHURCH:
IN IDEA AND IN HISTORY

I

Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης, Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας.—Matthew xxi. 11. οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης ἄτιμος, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.—Mark vi. 4.

ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ.—Luke xxiv. 19.

ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται.—Romans viii. 32.

Ἐνθένδε καὶ ἄθεοι κεκλήμεθα Καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομιζομένων θεῶν ἄθεοι εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου καὶ πατρὸς δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀνεπιμίκτου τε κακίας θεοῦ.—Justin Martyr, *Apologia*, i, 6.

Ὅσα οὖν παρὰ πᾶσι καλῶς εἴρηται, ἡμῶν τῶν χριστιανῶ ἐστι· τὸν γὰρ ἀπὸ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀῤῥήτου θεοῦ λόγον μετὰ τὸν θεὸν προσκυνοῦμεν καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ὅπως καὶ τῶν παθῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων συμμέτοχος γενόμενος καὶ ἴασιν ποιήσηται.—*Apologia*, ii, 13.

Ὀρθὸς λόγος παρελθὼν οὐ πάσας δόξας οὐδὲ πάντα δόγματα καλὰ ἀποδείκνυσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν φαῦλα, τὰ δὲ ἀγαθά.—*Apologia*, ii, 9.

Quo vos, benedicti, de carcere in custodiarium, si forte, translatos existimetis. Habet tenebras, sed lumen estis ipsi. Habet vincula, sed vos soluti deo estis. Triste illic expirat, sed vos odor estis suavitatis. Index expectatur, sed vos estis de judicibus ipsis indicaturi. Contristetur illi qui fructum sæculi suspirat. Christianus etiam extra carcerem sæculo renuntiavit, in carcere autem etiam carceri. Nihil interest, ubi sitis in sæculo, qui extra sæculum estis.—Tertullian, *Ad Martyras*, cap. ii.

Reason is *natural revelation*, whereby the Eternal Father of light and fountain of all knowledge communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties: *revelation* is *natural reason enlarged* by a new set of discoveries communicated by God immediately.—Locke, *Essay on Human Understanding*, chap. xix, 4.

Falsa religio dicitur superstitio; quia facit ut homines non contenti diuinis institutis, super illa veluti stare et assurgere conentur, tanquam ipso Deo sapientiores.—Alstedii, *Theologia Catechetica*, sect. i, cap. i.

I do not hesitate to affirm that our religion has been indebted to the *attempts*, though not the *intentions*, of its bitterest enemies. They have tried its strength, indeed, and, by trying, they have displayed its strength; and that in so clear a light, as we could never have hoped, without such a trial, to have viewed it. Let them, therefore, write; let them argue, and when arguments fail, even let them cavil against religion as much as they please; I should be heartily sorry that ever in this island, the asylum of liberty, where the spirit of Christianity is better understood—however defective the inhabitants are in the observance of its precepts—than in any other part of the Christian world; I should, I say, be sorry that in this island so great a disservice were done to religion as to check its adversaries in any other way than by returning a candid answer to their objections.—Principal George Campbell's *Dissertation on Miracles* in reply to Hume.

Facimus nos cum iis, qui duas ponunt Notas, unam velut a priori et antecedentem, doctrinæ scil. fundamentalis puritatem, alteram a posteriori et consequentem, vigtæ sanctitatem decentem, amore in Deum et fratres demonstratam.
Marckii, *Compendium Theologiæ*, cap. xxxii.

Εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι."—John viii. 58.

ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεὺς, ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος, ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος.—Hebrews vii. 26.

De nobis scilicet Diogenis dictum est: Megarenses obsonant quasi crastina die morituri, ædificant vero quasi numquam morituri. Sed stipulam quis in alieno oculo facilius perspicit quam in suo trabem.—Tertullian, *Apology*, cap. xxxix.

Hic est Dei cultus, hæc vera religio, hæc recta pietas, hæc tantum Deo debita servitus. Quæcumque igitur immortalis potestas quantalibet virtute prædita, si nos diligit sicut se ipsam, ei vult esse subditos, ut beati simus; cui et ipsa subdita beata est. Si ergo non colit Deum, misera est, quia Deo privatur; si autem colit Deum, non vult se coli pro Deo. Illi enim potius divinæ sententiæ suffragatur, et dilectionis viribus favet, qua scriptum est: *Sacrificans diis eradicabitur, nisi Domino soli.*—Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 10, cap. iii.

Es ist eine eigenthümliche Vollkommenheit der Entwicklung der Persönlichkeit des Erlösers, dass sie sich in der Einheit mit dem Ganzen des menschlichen Geschlechts entwickelt hat.—Rothe, *Stille Stunden*, p. 152.

Das Christenthum ist uns noch immer viel zu sehr blosse Religion, während es doch in der That ein ganzes neues menschliches Leben ist. Der Erlöser war ganzer Mensch.—*Ibid.*, p. 153.

Hat est jemals einen schlechthin originalen Menschen gegeben, so ist es Jesus gewesen.—*Ibid*, p. 153.

Dass einem Christus gross ist und dass er einem ein grosser Herr ist, das sind zwei himmelweit verschiedene Dinge.—*Ibid.*, p. 157.

Der Glaube ist beides, das Persönlichste und zugleich auch das Individuellste im Menschen.—*Ibid.*, p. 171.

To this purpose it pleaseth the Father of spirits, of old, to constrain the emperor of Rome, Antoninus Pius, to write to all the governors of his provinces to forbear to persecute the Christians; because such dealing must needs be so far from converting the Christians from their way, that it rather begat in their minds an opinion of their cruelties.—Roger Williams, *Bloudy Tenent of Persecution*, p. 110.

God never loves to plant his Church by blood.
Conscience ought not to be violated or forced.
Ibid., p. 152.

King James said to the fly, Have I three kingdoms, and thou must needs fly into my eye? Is there not enough to meddle withal upon the stage, or in love, or at the table, but religion?

Religion is like the fashion; one man wears his doublet slashed, another laced, another plain; but every man has a doublet; so every man has his religion. We differ about the trimming.—Selden, *Table Talk*, cxxi.

I

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN THE FIRST CENTURY *

I

1. THE Church is the body of Christ; and the churches into which the Church is not divided, but distributed, ought to be, as it were, incarnations of His Spirit, organs by which His beneficent activity is maintained and exercised on earth. So far as they have been this they have existed by Divine right, and been confessed by Christ before His Father who is in heaven and before His holy angels.† The multitude of churches or sects as they are named by sectarian ecclesiastics, is a witness to His inexhaustible significance, to the variety of the ways in which He may be apprehended and to the modes in which He can work. The evils of division which good men have mourned, and always will mourn, spring from the bitterness with which men resent difference from themselves or their loved institutions, not from the living relations of men or churches to Christ. If He were only as the Greek, or the Latin, or the Anglican Church conceived Him, He would not be the marvellous problem, and, as a consequence, could not be the marvellous power, He is. It is the wonder of men in the presence of Christ that has created the churches; they are so immense a multitude because He has been so creative a personality. A grand historic Church may

* Address from chair of Congregational Union in the May of 1883.

† Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8.

speak of skilled and devoted statesmanship; the multitudinous sects speak of the enthusiasm of a great regenerative love.

2. Whether the political or spiritual ideal of the Church be the truer and more excellent, might be a fitting enough subject of discussion from this chair. For one thing, it would be strictly relevant to our times, and might be made vindicative of our right as Congregational churches to be, especially as we exist by the truth and through the Spirit of Christ for the salvation of man; for we are churches devoted, almost by pre-eminence, to the realization of religion in the whole life of man, and, in particular, in all the institutions of the nation we proudly call Great Britain. Though Free Churches, we are yet churches consecrated to the creation of national religion, though it is a religion which loves to see the collective people doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly* before God. We distinguish between a National and an Established Church; for the one we feel the utmost reverence, but the other we do not even respect. For it is a small thing to us that a State endow a Church; but it is a great thing to us that the people who compose the State be penetrated by righteousness and inspired by truth. God will allow Himself to be honoured in no way but by an honourable and obedient life; and the church that has failed to make a nation believing, reverent, and dutiful to God may be an Established Church, without being in any real or even in a tolerable sense national.

We are not indifferent, then, to the stateliness of the political ideal, especially as incorporated in an ancient and historical Church. We may be but prosaic Philistines, yet we are not so utterly void of imagination as to feel no reverence for an institution which testifies to the continuous

* Micah vi. 8.

speech and presence of God with man, which awes by its past, its monuments, its comely and impressive worship; while it wins us by the many sweet yet ardent spirits among its living sons, and by the treasured memories of the saintly men who have loved it and lived for it. But, while we do not despise the political ideal, we love one that is simpler and more sublime, because it brings "the glory that excelleth"* into the common and indistinguished life of man. The supreme thing to us is the man's relation to Christ; where that is what it ought to be, all is well. The highest dignities are his; of these he is made largely yet modestly conscious, and becomes too reverent of himself to be a mean, or base, or unreal man any more. He is a king and priest unto God, a son of the everlasting Father, feeling his meanest moments transfigured by the light of the Eternal, the dustiest levels of his life watered by the stream that flowed "fast by the oracle of God."† Our ambition is to make men citizens of God's Kingdom, consciously loyal to no church but the Church, invisible and eternal, of Jesus Christ.

3. But I feel that there are fitter questions for this chair than even the questions as to our most distinctive church polities. Every question in polity reposes on a prior and more radical question in religion. The ultimate grounds, I will not say of our Nonconformity, but of our existence as Free Churches of Jesus Christ, are theological and religious, not political. Our reasons for dissenting from the Church of England are too fundamental to be merely or mainly ecclesiastical. We dissent because we believe that she fails adequately to interpret and realize for the people of England the religion of Christ. Where the matter is so radical, it is better to turn from the more occasional to the deeper

* 2 Cor. iii. 10. † *Paradise Lost*, bk. i, l. 12.

and more permanent issues. I would it were possible for the Christian people of England to forget for one splendid hour their ancient feuds; and to look to their ecclesiastical rivalries and controversies from, what may be termed, the standpoint of the Redeemer, and man's simple and direct relation to Him. He loves to be loved of men; the love of the obscurest and least ideal He holds most dear. Where it is real He would not forbid its expression, but would rather say, "Let the love work in its own way, and it will do well." He may have pleasure in the stateliest worship, but not so far as it is stately, only so far as it is the worship of love. He may have pleasure in the meanest worship, but not so far as it is mean, only so far as it is dignified by being worship in spirit and in truth. Were the churches able to look at each other from this standpoint, they would be able to see unity where now they feel only diversity; and would lose the ignorance which breeds contempt in the knowledge that begets respect and discovers brotherhood. Where controversy had reigned, emulation would live; the ambition to excel in the ministries of gentleness and peace would supersede the ambition to excel in authority, or to conquer in argument. Were the Church of Rome suddenly, yet deeply, moved by a true and tender affection for all sects or societies that truly love the Lord Jesus, would she not blush to own her past, hasten to abjure the infallibility which had consecrated its crimes; and by an act of noblest atonement, in which her old nature was lost and a new nature won, reconcile divided Christendom, and inspire it with new life and victorious energy? Were the Anglican Church to stand up before the English people penetrated with the conviction that love was the supreme thing, that to have it was to have all things, would she not confess that she had failed to be Christ's as Christ is God's;

and would she not look back with real and lively regret on the childish period when she prided herself on her orders, believed in her apostolic succession, and thought her connection with the State needed to secure the continued being and authority of religion in England? And would she not humbly ask the poorest body that loved the Lord, to let her love it? Were the Free Churches seized at the same moment by the like Divine passion, would not the spirit of jealousy die, the voice of mutual criticism and uncharitable judgment be hushed, and all their regenerative forces concentrated and organized into an irresistible army? Were anything like this to happen, men would indeed find that the Kingdom of God had come; and that Christian societies were the realized religion of Christ. And were they to realize it, its victory would be achieved. That victory tarries, not because the enemy is strong, but because the forces of Christendom are weak; and they are weak simply because they lack the love that unifies and compels to common and loyalest service. Where division from us is judged and treated as separation from Christ, there the very power truly to love man is lost; and with it goes the power to work as agencies reconciling men to God. He who hates a fellow-Christian can neither love a brother-man, nor make him feel loved of God.

II

1. Let us attempt, then, to look at the Christian religion dissociated from the sects and sectarianisms of to-day. The only moment when it can be so seen is the ideal period of its history; in that period it issued fresh and beautiful from the mind of Christ, and began in the hands of His apostles its glorious battle against evil and sin, and for God and

humanity. That moment lies far behind, yet it does not retreat from us, rather the distance lessens as time grows. The first and nineteenth centuries stand more fairly and clearly face to face than the nineteenth and tenth, or than the tenth and the first. The first is, indeed, in the history of man, the pre-eminent century, the nearest thing to the "Eternal Now" which time can know. All the centuries before it yearned towards it, all the centuries after it have felt its presence; its events lie behind, but its spirit goes before. It has scored itself so deeply into the mind of man that he cannot forget or feel remote from it; nay, it had to wait till it had created the very faculty of knowledge before it could be known. And the better it is known, the nearer it seems, the more living, creative, authoritative it becomes.

Let us think, then, what a work was done between the years 30 and 90 of our era, only sixty years in all! Jesus had spoken His words, created His society, died His death — made Himself, in His three years' ministry, the wonder and the salvation of man. He had called men to be His apostles, had endowed them with the Spirit, and the tongues of fire; and they had gone forth preaching His word, founding churches, saving men, making through and for the men saved a literature that was to be the most sacred literature of civilized man, and of man it civilized. When those sixty years ended, all seemed, at Babylon, and Alexandria, and Athens, and Rome, as it had been when they began. But all was changed — man to the world, and the world to man. Another notion of God, another idea of religion, another ideal of humanity had come to reign over his spirit; a vaster immensity had opened round his soul, a mightier eternity appealed to his imagination and kindled his hope. The change penetrated everywhere: it was to affect political

institutions, making them freer and humaner; it was to recreate literature, supplying philosophy with sublimer subjects of speculation, poetry with grander themes, history with its most wonderful pages and at once most irresistible and insoluble problem, and devotion with its loftiest inspiration. Art was to feel the new spirit, and rise from the rudest beginnings in dark catacombs to its most splendid achievements; Architecture was to build temples to the honour of Christ's name; Painting, through its love of Him, was to idealize the manhood, the womanhood, and the infancy of earth, that they might become symbols of the humanities that live in God; Music, exalted and transformed by His influence, if not changing her very nature, yet becoming a new art that she might the better sing the praise of His passion, and the more fitly render the exultation of His victory. The supreme moments in the later centuries have been the moments when the first has been mightiest; when the Christ has, as it were, entered anew the spirit of man — inspired it with a deeper hate of tyranny, falsehood, sin and wrong, and a more victorious love of freedom, truth, and righteousness. The centuries and peoples that love these most know Christ best; the more of these there is in an age, the nearer the age stands to Him. It is His growing mastery over the human spirit that makes our day struggle so strenuously to stand in the presence of Deity. Man feels that if he had once pierced and possessed the mystery of Christ, his last problem would be solved, his deepest need be satisfied.

2. Now, if we are to understand the work of those sixty years — what Christianity was in the century of its birth and what it then achieved — we must look at it from within; see it as it came to its own age, rather than as it has come to ours. The meaning of the early missions has been re-

vealed to us as it was not to the early missionaries; for it did not stand so clear before the eyes of the apostles as it does before ours. Theirs was a stiller, simpler, smaller world than the one we know. "All nations," speaks more of collective mankind, which is an immenser and more oppressive thought now than then. We know, as they did not, how religions possess people — have roots that so clasp rock and soil that they can be lifted only, as it were, by lifting the solid earth out of its place. To "make disciples of all nations"* was a task so stupendous that it was hidden by its very magnitude. Man had to wait till time and history had lifted him to a position high enough to overlook humanity before he could even guess its size. It needed the interpretation of Providence to show what the apostolic work meant and achieved. The men who did it were denied the interpretation, but only that they might the better do the work. It was lucky, indeed, that they could not see, as we do, the measure or the issues of their mission; if they had, perhaps its very vastness would have paralyzed their energies; but they knew the inspiration of the love of Him who sent them. Strong in it, they went forth, assured of His presence to do their work; and they so did it as to make their century the pre-eminent century of time, the mother of all that was holy and true, free and good, in the centuries it carried in its bosom.

3. When these sixty years opened, what was there of Christianity? All that was of it lived in the person of Jesus, silent, undiscovered, unsuspected. Now, consider what this means! To understand it, He must be seen, not through the faith and history of the centuries which followed; but as He came to His work, before outer action

* Matt. xxviii. 19.

had made His inner meaning manifest. He rises before us a Syrian peasant, poor, obscure, unlettered, in the mean home and sordid surroundings which have in the East proved so fatal to the higher manhood. The common life of man is His, though He may have lived it in beautiful blamelessness. Suddenly He breaks years of golden silence by a brief year or two of golden speech. Poor men hear Him, love Him, follow Him; lettered scribes study Him, attempt to puzzle Him, get puzzled, disapprove of Him, and do their best to discredit Him with the people; astute and venerable priests dislike Him, fear lest His action should become injurious to their order and their interests, and so they plot His death. In the irony or the wisdom of Providence the obscurity in His coming was eclipsed by the infamy in which He died.

This is outer history, all that the eyes of a Pilate, or even a Tacitus, saw; but was it all that could be seen? "No," say some, "there were His wonderful works; what men of later days were to call miracles, finding them a burden or a support to faith, just as the idea of nature or of Christ was the greater." The argument was first put by Nicodemus when he said: "Rabbi, we know that Thou art a teacher come from God: for no man could do those signs which Thou doest, except God were with him."* Well, the miracles need not concern us; His supreme works were not physical, but spiritual; undiscernible by sense, but only the more marvellous to thought. His words were few, but they were so wondrous that they shame into silence all the wisest words of the wisest men, and steal over the earth as if the voice of the Eternal had broken into softest speech. His words, indeed, come to comfort sorrow; to work contrition; to fill persons with

* John iii. 2.

unspeakable love to God and tenderness to man; to give to peoples a law they ought to obey. His ideals they most revere when they are most civilized, even while confessing that they are the hardest, because the highest, ideals that have ever come to man. His character was so exalted, so perfect, so holy; reposed on a faith in God so absolute, incorporated an ideal of man so universal and transcendent, that it has lifted the conception of manhood throughout the world; and made men feel its dignity, beauty, its splendid possibilities; and forced men to see how humanity stood so allied to Deity that they could be wedded without man ceasing to be human, or Deity Divine. His mission, as He conceived it, was of all missions the strangest, yet the most sublime — to found a kingdom of saved men, renewed spirits, obedient to God, dutiful to man, living as citizens of earth, while possessed and owned of Eternity. His idea of His own person and place was such as had never before entered into the mind of man; measured by the common standard, it was altogether audacious; judged by Himself, it was but seemly and becoming — He was Son of Man, no man's son, God's Son; He who alone knows the Father, the only medium through whom the Father could be known; able to save, able to punish, by His life enlightening, by His death redeeming, the world. When we listen to Jesus as He appears and lives in history, we feel in a world of paradox, so mean are His conditions, so grand His person and His speech. When we turn to the history which interprets Him, we feel in a world of mightier wonders and vaster problems. His loftiest claims are more than justified; the mean arena on which He lived becomes but the fixed point from which He was to move the world; His ministry of a transient moment has been proved to be a ministry of the Eternal. What name is

like to His? What honour can be compared to the honour He has received? The men who bear His name are expected to be the most blameless and beneficent of men. The societies that exist for His purposes and through His truth are the mightiest religious societies, and possess the mightiest religion in the world. His person has been so construed that it bears to faith the form of God; His name so praised that it stands above every name. His moment of deepest shame has become His moment of highest glory; the death He died is a sacrifice He offered through the Eternal Spirit on account of the sin and for the salvation of man. These are not mere wonders of dreamland; they are sober matters of history, and indubitable realities of human experience. Where and while the memory of His death was most vivid these things were preached concerning Him. That death was hardly twenty years old when the most wonderful of the treatises which explain its meaning were written. In twenty years more societies that loved and worshipped Him, and lived by faith in His name, were to be found in every city of the Roman Empire. Providence had spoken; man might doubt, deny, resist, but the decree was fixed and irrevocable. By this Christ — springing out of His very being, as it were, the spontaneous yet purposed and necessary creation of His person — a new religion had come, manifestly destined of God to be the universal religion of man.

III

1. Here, then, is our starting-point: Christ creates Christianity, His is its being; everything material or essential in it runs back into Him. Men may say, "The religion owes less to Jesus than to Paul; he made its high and

spiritual universalism." But Paul made no part of the matter, made only the form in which it could best be stated, the terms in which it could most fitly be explained. The theology of Paul was a science of Christ, and without the Christ no science of Him had been possible. This is a matter we must understand; it is a luminous point lighting up what were otherwise densest darkness, making manifest the relation between the creative Person and the created religion. Note "the man" Paul, a Jew, with the blood of his race hot and strong in him; cradled in Judaism, learned in it, zealous for it, ready to live, to die, to love, to hate for it; with pity enough for the unfortunate Gentile, and with no pity for the apostate Jew. His teachers, the men he most revered, who had done the most to form and furnish his mind, were the men who had most controverted and condemned the words of Jesus. The priests, the men whose office was the most sacred and honoured in his ancestral religion, were the men who had, for the good and safety of the people, demanded that Jesus should be crucified. One who had so merited the hate of Judaism, was not one Paul could easily learn to love; nay, to confront with open face the mere historical truth, to conceive Jesus as in any sense or degree true, must have been, to a man so constituted, fashioned, situated, a matter of transcendent difficulty. Yet, this initial difficulty surmounted, what is the result? This man of royal spirit and eagle vision — in speculative genius, in dialectic, in mass and passion of moral nature, among the foremost men of his day — builds, within twenty years of the crucifixion, an immense and finely articulated system which has the Divine Sonship of Jesus as its basis, and the reconciliation of all things in Him to God as its apex. Could you calculate the force needed to effect, not only the revolution, but the constructive achievement? Think of the man's race, of the

passion with which he loved its history, schools, faith, worship; of his enthusiasm for the honour, the unity, the sole sovereignty of God; yet the knowledge of Jesus works so mighty a change in this man as to make him, even while sitting in the shadow of the cross, ascribe to Him divine names and dignities; to conceive Him as "the Lord from heaven," "the Lord of glory," "the Son of God," "who saves by His grace" and reigns over all. The thing is wonderful, has no parallel anywhere. There have been great religious teachers; founders, too, of great religions, but no one has ever, by the very generation that knew and handled him, been honoured like our Christ; been all at once, to its faith and reason alike, a centre round which a new world crystallized — a world which explained yet repealed, fulfilled yet abolished the old. In a moment, at His touch, as it were, a new system of the universe rose, founded on Him. God was changed, invested with a richer nature, a more manifold unity, a fatherliness that made His sovereignty as gracious as it was supreme. Man was changed, took a vaster meaning, stood in all his centuries and in all his units a mighty organism, built round the Christ. The inheritance from the past, the outlook as regards the future, the duties to the present, the possibilities of evil, the capabilities of good — all were changed, at once and for ever, by this contact of Jesus with the thought and the spirit of man. It was not simply the words He spoke, the works He did, the death He died; it was Himself; He changed everything, became the new object of faith that made the whole world of faith new. But what does this mean? Does it not mean that the person created the religion? that the being of Christ was the birth of Christianity? His appearance was its becoming: by Him alone it lived and lives.

2. The religion, then, thus created and instituted, spring-

ing from its living root in the Person of its Founder, begins to be, and begins to be as a religion at once missionary and universal. It is intended to embrace "all nations," to be preached to all men everywhere. Now, mark, this is an aboriginal and essential characteristic of the religion. Paul did not create this universalism; Jesus did. It was because Jesus had done it that Paul so victoriously vindicated alike his gospel and his mission. But a religion at once universal, aggressive, and exclusive, claiming the faith of all men, allowing no other faith to stand by its side, was an unheard-of thing, a creation of an absolutely new order. Religions, especially in Western Asia and Europe, had hitherto been national; the gods of a land were its people's — respected, perhaps, by other nations, but only as a means of showing respect to the nations whose gods they were. When Rome became a universal empire she thought that she ought to be universal in her religious interests and regards; and so she built her Pantheon, and made welcome to it the deities of her multitudinous subject-peoples. That was encyclopædic, but not universal; to recognize all gods as true is the precise opposite of the worship of the only true God. In the far East, indeed, an immense missionary religion was already four centuries old. Buddhist preachers had spread throughout India, were penetrating the farther East, and, perhaps, seeking a way into the sated and sceptical and superstitious West. But Buddhism was no genuine universalism; it could associate with other faiths, could accept a divided homage, and where alone, it was too fatal to the social sanity of man to be capable of life in lands where the social ideal was plastic and sovereign. But the religion of Jesus was, as it were, a born universalism; to be such was its native and inalienable characteristic. It was ideal, spiritual, encum-

bered by no polity, burdened by no ritual, organized into no system, but absolutely a religion of spirit and truth.

3. Now this, its intrinsic character, was expressed in its earliest and most distinctive action — its missions. The men Christ left behind were witnesses to His truth; their ambition was to be preachers, and to increase the multitude of believers. Within the heart of the religion, the words, "make disciples of all nations," seemed to work like a passion. Now, just consider the stupendous range, the magnificent ambition of this ideal universalism, with the undertakings and enterprises it involved. No dream of universal empire can be named beside it; it was indeed a dream of transcendent empire, dominion over the mind and conscience of man. And it was an empire which meant peace, making all men of one spirit as of one faith, binding earth to heaven by the golden chain of love. Even on the negative side its daring was extraordinary enough; it denied either the truth or the sufficiency, or both, of the old religions. Now that was a tremendous denial. It could not but, where most emphatic and effective, provoke hatred and persecution. Christianity rose on the ancient world like an immense negation; it was abhorred as a "pestilential superstition," whose breath was fatal to the faiths venerable by age. Then, even more than now, religion was woven into the heart and history, into the lives and conditions, into the laws and customs of the peoples. It was less a thing of eternity, more a matter of time, bound up with the State, inseparable from the nation, the nation inseparable from it. Man was more religious as a citizen than even as a person; not for his own sake was he religious, but for the people's. The impious man was dangerous to the State, because the religion belonged to the State, and therefore to the citizens; not to the citizens, and therefore

to the State. It was a matter of public concern and custom, and not of personal conviction and profession. It lived, therefore, endeared by all that exalted and glorified the country, hallowed by the reverence of centuries, the heroism of the fathers, the songs and the memories of the fatherland; it was the shrine of all the ideals the past had transmitted to the present, and the house to which the present entrusted its treasures for the future. To deny the truth of the religion was like denying the right of the nation to be; to bid the people renounce their gods was like bidding them forswear their past, and throw the order and civilization they had realized into irredeemable chaos.

But while the tremendous negation was the first thing that struck and startled the ancient world, the cardinal and characteristic matter was the affirmation within and behind it. Christianity was a system of splendid Positivism; it denied only that it might the more strenuously affirm. It had one God for all men, Jew and Greek alike. It declared all men of one blood, offspring of the one God, kinsmen after the flesh, brothers according to the Spirit. It concluded all men under sin, that God might have mercy upon all. It proclaimed one faith, one Saviour, one salvation, commanded every man to repent, promised to all who believed the life and happiness of God, threatened all who disbelieved with indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish. Its universalism was most particular, rested on a notion of religion that stood in absolute antithesis to the older and current notions. The universe it wished to create was a universe of convinced and converted units, not of imperious and coercive policies. Religion was a matter of spirit and conscience, the man alone could be religious, and even he only as his reason was persuaded, his faith real, his life commanded by the truth. But think what an in-

novation and dream it was to create a universal religion on these lines! What an idea it implied of the dignity, the free, yet essential reasonableness of man! of the truth, the rational power, and the moral authority of the religion! It did not appeal to the ambition of kings, the selfishness of States, the fears or passions of societies; but it stood before the personal reason and spoke to it, before the slumbering and awakened conscience and appealed to it, trusting to its own might as spirit, and truth, and love. Man had come from God, was of God's kin and kind; the truth, too, had come from God; and the splendid faith was that the godlike affinities of man and the truth would find each other, meet, and blend, that they might bind man to God. Where else came there ever so sublime an ideal? an ambition so divine? Beside it the dreams of conquerors and statesmen are poor, and mean, and vulgar. The capabilities and dignities of humanity slumbered till this universalism came and waked them to life; and why, but because the ideal immanent in our nature and the idea manifest in the truth were alike of God, made and, as it were, mated in the one Eternal Mind?

IV

1. But now this brings us to another point: the agencies through which this universalism was to be realized — it was by Preaching, speech of the men who knew Jesus, understood His mind, and were possessed of His spirit and His truth. There never was an agency so simple or so effectual. No cause could have seemed more poorly equipped, so without the energies necessary for conquest, the means needed for bare life. It was entrusted to eleven men of Galilee. They were humble, undistinguished men, without birth

or education, experience or knowledge of the world. They had been either fishermen or tax-gatherers, familiar with the lake and towns of Galilee, unacquainted with other lands and peoples. They could scarcely be said to know letters; might perhaps be able to read the Hebrew Bible, but were even more than we are ignorant of the literature of Greece and Rome; without the eye to perceive their beauties or appraise their wealth. Their heroes, the great men they knew and revered, were of their own race only: their father Abraham, Moses their lawgiver, David their patriot king, Solomon their ideal sage, Isaiah their sublime prophet. But the men whose names were honoured in the schools of culture, potent in the academies, applauded in the Forum, poets like Homer or Sophocles or Lucretius, philosophers like Plato or Aristotle or Epicurus, orators and statesmen like Demosthenes and Cicero, were to them utterly unknown. Those eleven Galileans were, in a sense, children; they knew not the thoughts, the doubts, the despairs, the agonies and passions of soul that lived and wrestled in the great world. Like children, they were unconscious of the awful tragedies that were being enacted before and around them, though it might be they were only the better able to fill the stage with a sweeter and happier presence.

Yet they would have been a mightier enigma to the great world than it was to them. Imagine what Athens or Rome would have thought had it been told that a new religion had been instituted by a few Jews, and that eleven men of Galilee were about to essay the conversion of the world. You can almost hear the ripple of laughter that would run over either city as it heard the news. Try a parallel case: here is an immense capital, where, perhaps, is collected the largest mass of conscious wisdom in the world, where the English Parliament meets, where wealth and society have

their home, where law and justice do their best to live in harmony and serve the common good; where the makers of literature and the producers of books live, if not in unity, at least together, and an all-wise press consents to distribute its unerring judgments and impartial light. Well, then, imagine this: eleven men come here from some distant fishing village, on sea-coast or loch-side, and, undismayed, with calmly deliberate speech and purpose, begin, in the very face of London, to attempt the conversion of the world. You can conceive how the news would be greeted on the streets, in the lobby of the House, in the clubs, or the places where idle men and would-be wits most do congregate. Yet this could not seem so extravagant an enterprise as did that of the Galileans. The world is used to attempts at its conversion now, but then they were utterly undreamed of; the idea of one religion, of missions on behalf of any religion, had never entered the sane and cultivated mind. And when the men who were guilty of this most adventurous and original idea, and the fields on which they were to realize it, were compared — their extravagance must have seemed touched with most innocent madness. Around them was Judaism, fanatical, furious, its appetite whetted, not glutted, by having tasted the blood of the Master. Before them were the religions glorified by the art and poetry of Greece, the martial and political supremacy of Rome, the wealth and proud antiquity of Egypt, the traditions, the customs, the patriotisms of all the ancient peoples. The dream of these men was, indeed, extraordinary; only one thing has been more marvellous than their dream — its fulfilment. It would have been wonderful, above all others to themselves, had they not known that "God had chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God had chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are

mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised had God chosen, yea, and things which are not to bring to nought things that are."*

2. But these men were not allowed to stand long alone; they were soon joined by a man of richest nature and pre-eminent power. Born of Hebrew parents, in the Free City of Tarsus, he stood related, as it were, organically to two most dissimilar peoples, histories, minds.† From his parents he received the stern, intense, concentrated religious nature of the Hebrew, the pride and privilege of an honoured Abrahamic descent, possession of the oracles of God, knowledge of Messianic beliefs, which were capable of the meanest or noblest interpretation. From his birth in a city which was both Greek and Roman, and from his Greek training he derived his sympathy with man, his idea of a freer and finer manhood than Judea knew, his knowledge of heathen morality and religion, his insight into the pagan mind, and subtle ability to realize the Hellenic devotion to a faith which was the apotheosis of the beautiful, and aversion to a faith which was the deification of humility and suffering. From this city he derived his knowledge of Roman Law, his sense of the dignity of citizenship, and his idea of a State and city coextensive with civilized man. In his single person, therefore, two races and two worlds met; he was heir, on the one side, to Hebrew religion, literature, knowledge, and could well understand the history which led up to Christ, and the Christ who fulfilled it; he was heir, on the other, to the humaner ideals, the sunnier, yet deeper thought, the loftier and more creative imagination of Greece, and could interpret at once the attitude of the Greco-Roman intellect to Christ, and the meaning of Christ to the mind, whether Roman or Greek. God made Paul

* 1 Cor. i. 27–8. † *v. infra*, the chapter on Paul.

for the moment, the moment for Paul. Providence works through persons, and this strange strong personality was one of its chiefest works. What our dainty modern criticism considers a defect was a high excellency. He was without culture in the academic sense; the Greek philosophies he did not know, though when need was he had strength of brain and discipline enough to grasp their subtlest doctrines. But he knew Greek manhood; he loved not the speculations, but the men of Greece.

If he had been a child of the schools he might have been able to speak their language, and think their thoughts after them; but would he have been as open of heart to the common humanities? as able to enter with Divine simplicity the sanctuary of the new faith, to speak its mysteries to the only persons who would hear? That mind of Paul's is a ceaseless marvel to me: so strong in its love of man, willing to be accursed from Christ for the Jew; to live, to die, to suffer utmost loss for the Gentile; so strong in its love of truth, sundering the dearest ties to follow it, breaking with the past, sacrificing the present, having no wish to be, save as obedient to it. Think how the heart of him beats in those epistles of his, how the pain of despised love still throbs in their broken idioms and abrupt strong terms; how his enthusiasm for the good of man, how his whole massive manhood, penetrated, possessed, commanded by his gospel, stands there, as it were, in everlasting motion, ever creating new and higher forms of life, without in any measure ceasing to be. And the speech which clothes his gospel is so wonderful; not classical, or academic, or in any sense scholastic, but so living, so simple and strong, as of a man who had got truth, so new and so straight from God that he had to make the very speech which was to embody it. The only parallel to Paul is Moses; what the one

did for the old law, the other did for the new. Moses was a Hebrew by descent, but an Egyptian by education. By nature he understood the one people, by culture the other. He was a mediator between Egypt and the Hebrews, just as Paul was a mediator between the Hebrews and the Greeks. Moses carried the vine out of Egypt and planted it in Palestine, and Paul brought the living vine out of Palestine and planted it throughout the world. The historical Moses localized it that it might be the better sheltered and nourished into ripeness; Paul universalized it that it might gladden all people and enlighten all lands. The works were different, yet connected; the first prepared for the second, the second was the fulfilment of the first. In each case the fittest workman was chosen. Ancient Hebraism vindicated God's wisdom in the choice of Moses; living Christianity has justified His wisdom in the choice of Paul.

V

1. But it is not enough to study the men; we must also consider the instrument they used, the Word or Gospel they preached. They began their mission by being witnesses of Christ, crucified and risen; they expected to convert the world, to establish the universal and spiritual religion by preaching Him. He was their sole theme; His name summarized all of truth they had to tell. The truth He contained was, indeed, vast, but they did not bewilder man by exhibiting the broad surface or immense circumference of the truth; their ambition was to show it condensed into the point of living light, which they termed the Christ. Behind the presentation was their own knowledge, for without it they could not have made all the scattered rays converge into the one splendid focus; but they knew that it must be with all as it had been with themselves — for only

through faith in the person of the King could man enter into the Kingdom of the Truth. By what must have seemed to the cultured critics of the day a low and offensive perversity, they emphasized the humiliation, sufferings, death of the Christ. They had no wish to conceal any feature of His lowliness, any element of His shame; nay, without these, they would have been without their Gospel. The Christ they had to preach was the One who "bare our sins in His own body on the tree";* the most fervent prayer they could utter, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ."†

The symbol was extraordinary — might have seemed selected expressly to offend. We are quite unable to imagine the deep offence it then gave. It comes to us baptized in the holiest associations, sublimed by the love, the faith, the achievements of centuries; it speaks not of crime or of barbarous death, but of the grace that loved from eternity, and redeemed by a sacrifice which was the salvation of man, but the passion of God. The change Jesus worked in the cross was a miracle all the more wonderful that it was what men might call posthumous. All at once, by virtue of what He suffered on it, it ceased to be the sign of the felon slave's death, and became the symbol of a hope victorious over the grave. Since then, it has graced the tomb of the martyred saint, burned on the breast of the crusader, worked creatively in the imagination of the poet, been an inspiration to painters, who have painted on their knees, as it were in worship; it has been pictured by the preacher as the emblem of peace, the ground of reconciliation between man and God; it has even on the field of battle marked the point where carnage must cease, and the gentle heart of woman and the skilled hand of man

* 1 Peter ii. 24. † Gal. vi. 14.

be allowed to minister tenderly to the dying, and to do for the wounded their healing and beneficent work. But in the apostolic age, the Cross meant only guilt and shame; it was the symbol of what was meanest in life, most infamous in act, and criminal in death. No man loved it, of all men it was hated and abhorred; doubly hated of the free born, as the instrument of death at once of a criminal and a slave. But this abhorred cross was the object in which the apostles gloried, and placed in the forefront as the symbol of their universal religion, the very epitome of the Word that saved. Just think how this would strike a stranger — say a Greek. He loved the beautiful; his religion was so steeped in it, that he could not tell where religion ended and art began. The poets had in immortal verse praised the beauty of the gods. The temples where he worshipped, whether severe in Doric simplicity or rich in Corinthian ornament, seemed like dreams of architectural beauty suddenly realized in stone. Sculptors had idealized the human form, that it might the more fitly be the symbol of the Divine; and had so splendidly succeeded, that men felt when they looked on the Zeus of Phidias, as if they had seen the very image and face of God. Now, imagine a man whose mind so inseparably associated the religious and the beautiful — who believed with Plato that the beautiful, like the good, was only another name for the Divine — suddenly confronted with the doctrine of the Cross, summoned to believe that God had been manifested in One who had lived as a Jewish peasant, and had died crucified between two thieves. Was it possible that such a doctrine should seem other to him than the apotheosis of the abhorrent? Need we wonder that he scornfully declared it no wisdom of God, but utter "foolishness of man"?*

* 1 Cor. i. 21.

2. The apostles knew right well what the Jew and the Gentile alike thought. Their preaching of the Cross was no matter of will or pleasure, but of sheer and simple necessity; for only so, and not otherwise, could the truth be spoken, and man be saved. Do you think that Paul did not know how his gospel appeared to the Greek? or the sort of insult it seemed to the Jew? If he had been under any illusion, "stripes and imprisonment"* would soon have dispelled it. But he was under none. Every letter he wrote bears the ineffaceable imprint of his pain and his heroism before the shame of the Cross. He was a man of rarely sensitive soul, of imagination so strong that the thoughts of other men lived before his mind almost as if they had been his own. He could feel the very loathing of the Greek, and the passion which burned in the Jew. There is nothing that so shows to me the power of Paul's spirit, or the pathos of his position, as the way in which he stood between two strong emotions and ruled both — the emotion created by his own knowledge of the truth, and the emotion created by his knowledge of what it seemed to men when they first heard it. He had to speak, most vividly conscious that what was the grace of God to him was to them the worst foolishness of men.† And his apostolic strength lay here, that, while possessed of this most paralyzing of all knowledge, he had the devotion and endurance to speak and to persuade till his standpoint became theirs, and his love displaced and extinguished their loathing.

But that we may understand what "the doctrine of the Cross" did mean to the then world we, too, must change our point of view; and look at it from within rather than from without. That doctrine was mighty from what it signified to the spirit, not from what it seemed to the senses.

* 2 Cor. vi. 5; xi. 23–7. † 1 Cor. i. 23–5.

A new Godhead was in it, a new Humanity, a new whole spiritual Universe. It was the symbol in time of the very Godhead of God, of verities as old as eternity, though only then become manifest. Man is made by his thought of God; as he thinks of God, nature and life are to him, nay, he is to himself. God was to the Greek inflexible law, or retributive and iron fate, the order which was stern to punish, though impotent to save. There was nothing so undivinely merciless as the divine beauty of Greece. The Greek knew no love to God, for the love of God was to him unknown. His ideal deity was the Zeus of Aeschylos, an inexorable will, able to be supreme only by being retributive, as pitiless to a beneficent Prometheus as to a guilty Klutemnestra. Plato made love divine, but abstract love is love without life, is no object of affection, and can awaken none. To live in a universe where no pity reigns, which has no heart of grace, is to live in a hell; the men it imprisons come to hate their home, to abhor their life, and prove themselves greater than their universe by defying it, by challenging its pitiless forces to work their death. The Jew might seem happier than the Greek; his God was personal, eternal, the Creator and Sovereign of man. But there are no sadder laments over the transiency of life and the mortality of man than those we owe to the Jew. His God was too remote from men to be touched with humanity; the God of the Jew only, was no Deity for universal man.

3. But the doctrine of Christ changed God to man, and man to God. He was the Son of the Eternal, and the eternal Son. Fatherhood was immanent in Deity, who had never been other than a Father, which signified that love was as eternal as Himself; to have a Son was essential to His being as God. The love within was the basis

of the love without; the internal activities of God were but His affections in exercise, and so His external activities could not but be the same. And thus the creation stood in the affection of the Godhead, shared, as it were, the affection of the Father for the Son. And so man stood on earth the child of the Eternal, the offspring of God, bound to Him by the divinest of all ties — that of the love which had brooded over him even before it had called him into being. But where man and God were so united, the sin of man became the sorrow of God, the guilt of the Son involved the pain of the Father. Men have spoken of the Divine impassibility; they have said, "Deity is perfect, the perfect must be the happy, and the perfectly happy cannot suffer." But it were an empty happiness that never knew love, and a callous love which never knew sorrow at the sight of sin. Sacrifice is a fact of the eternal nature; the death of Christ was its symbol and manifestation in time. That death declared that man's sin meant God's passion, that God could not bear to lose the soul He loved. Nor could He save it without such sacrifice as showed His vengeance against sin and love of righteousness. And so, in the Cross, there was found a point from which man, looking upward, could see God as God sees Himself; and, looking at once inward and outward, could know man as man is known to God. From that double view there came a light which changed the shame of the Cross into surpassing glory, made all things in heaven and on earth new, and forced from the lips the cry, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out!"*

4. But the doctrine of the Cross in being interpretative

* Rom. xi. 33.

of God was also recreative of man. The response to the new faith was the new religion; the belief in the Divine Fatherhood found its realization in a conscious human sonship, conformed in spirit and character to Christ's. The God who had loved man unto sacrifice was a God man was bound to love unto obedience. But the love that could not bear to lose, implied the dearness of the being saved to the Being who saved him. Man could contribute to the happiness of God; God loved to hold fellowship with man. The doctrine of the Cross based religion on this mutual love — the Divine, creative; the human, responsive; and the doctrine made manifest that man was to God what Jesus had been, with its necessary counterpart, that God was to man what He had been to Jesus. The sacrifice that saved was explained by a life which showed how the saved were to live.

Now, this affected and changed the very idea of religion. Man, in order to worship God, had employed holy persons — priests; holy places — altars and temples; holy rites and seasons — acts and days of atonement. Without these, religion was impossible; men could not feel safe from God unless priest, temple and sacrifice stood between Him and them. But the Cross abolished these; grace reconciled the Father in heaven, and the sons on earth lived in immediate fellowship. And this open intercourse, this filial immediacy of communion and speech, was of the very essence of Christ's own ideal. The religion He instituted was absolutely without the most distinctive elements of the old religious institutions. It knew no priesthood — had nothing for any priesthood to do, had no material temple, the spirit of the new man being the temple of the living God; it had no fleshly sacrifices either, man's "reasonable service" being a living sacrifice which alone

was acceptable to God.* Christ therefore called no disciple a priest, endowed none with priestly functions; made His collective society a holy and spiritual priesthood, but did not equip it with any priestly class. A completer act of abolition was impossible, or one of mightier moment and significance. It meant that His people, like Himself, were sons; that the filial relation was too direct and sacred to suffer any alien to intermeddle with it; that the fellowship ought to be so clear and close as to make the child feel as if his spirit were a mirror of his Father's heart. The man who knows himself a happy and reconciled son, feels the priest's a divisive presence. So deeply did this enter into the ideal of the new religion, that it is only sober truth to say — the degree in which a system restores a priesthood, is the measure of its departure from Christ. The men who seek through ritual, ceremonial, or sacrifice to worship God, prefer bondage under the ancient schoolmaster,† who was a creature of the poor and burdensome law, to the spirit and adoption of sons.

All that this doctrine implied may not here be told. The ideal of a new world was in it, forces reconstructive of humanity worked in its bosom. No such centre of new moral, religious, revolutionary energies had ever come out of eternity into time. Infinite promise was in it for individual souls, regenerative agencies, ameliorative and progressive forces, boundless hopes and highest possibilities for the race. Silently, without noise of the builder's tools, the new Jerusalem had descended out of heaven from God; softly, unperceived by the coarse senses of statesmen and thinkers, there had fallen the seeds of a new mankind, which was to be organized in faith and love unto righteousness.

* Rom. xii. 1. † Gal. iii. 24–5.

VI

1. But it is not enough to study the new religion, we must also glance at the age in which it lived. Over against the Church stood the world it was to conquer. The forces seemed so disproportionate that to have spoken of a conflict then would have been too grotesque even for pleasantry. Now we know that they did meet in the most terrible and deadly struggle known to history. The Church did not come out of it scathless or uninjured, but Rome did not issue from it alive.

Of Judaism it is not necessary to speak; the nation as distinct from the people that professed it was in the agonies of death. Providence suffered it not to live. The Jews helped the new faith in the most efficient possible way, by bringing about the ruin of their capital and their religion. Few things could have served the cause of Christ so well as the fall of Jerusalem. It saved His faith from its greatest danger, prevented it making the soil of Judea sacred, Jerusalem its holy city; and cast it, as it were, homeless upon the Gentiles. So we need not touch Judaism; the first of the Christian generations saw its defeat. The Judaic thought that attempted to penetrate and transform the new gospel was vanquished by Paul; the spell which the ancient traditions, customs and places, were beginning to exercise over the new religion, was for ever broken by the legions of Vespasian.

2. We note, as a thing not friendly to Christianity, the political condition. Rome was in the proudest moment of her imperial history, and reigned undisputed queen of the civilized world. There never was so perfect a political machine alike for purposes of conquest and of rule; so masterful, yet so tolerant, so irresistible in its imperial

strength, yet so mindful of national susceptibilities. She had gathered into her mighty network the ancient empires of the east and south, Western Persia, Egypt, Carthage, Greece, and the nascent peoples of the west and north. And where Roman armies went, Roman Law followed; universal conquest meant political unity, and an order — if need be, a solitude — which was at least outward peace. Now, this imperial unity did in some respects help the new faith. Resistance to Rome was so hopeless that, in its presence, national ambitions died. The enforced peace of the peoples made many a generous spirit turn for consolation to the mysteries of religion; for exercise, to the problems of life and destiny. The one empire created a feeling of oneness among the nations, made them form a sort of brotherhood, and so paved the way for the idea of a common religion. Then, too, the rule of the one city secured to the Roman citizen, however he came by his freedom, rights and a home everywhere, and so over those Christian missionaries who were Roman citizens was thrown the ægis of its great power. Then intercourse was easy, roads made the remotest provinces accessible; the imperial, though not the universal, tongue was so known in all Roman cities that the preacher who could use it was a man who could be everywhere understood. But the unity was advantageous only while the empire was propitious; let it be hostile, and what then? Why, it could everywhere and at once bring all the engines of an irresistible and relentless government to bear on anything it wished to suppress, especially if they were things of faith. In every city, from Palestine to Britain, from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, it could act as it willed against what it hated. It might well seem that Cæsar had but to nod, and the iron feet of his legions would soon break into pieces the small

societies which the Christian missionaries had been so painfully labouring to form. At any suggestion of their strength, he would have laughed louder than leviathan ever did at the shaking of a spear.

3. Hence a fact within the age determining its attitude to the religion, and a condition affecting the action of the religion on it, is its moral and social state. The moral systems of antiquity are even now our most perfect systems — their ethical ideal remains a noble ideal. The good man Plato loved to imagine and picture, still appeals to our admiration and love. What claims to be our best culture studies and praises the Aristotelian mean, with its balanced and harmonious activities. The Stoic doctrine supplies us with an idea of strong and upright manliness. What speculation then could do for morals was done in the ancient world; its science was perfect, though its conduct was at fault. But the fault was disastrous; it meant that the mind which could dream the beautiful could not do the good. The theoretical spirit was indeed still young and stoical. Seneca lived on the ethical field, the rival, if not the kinsman, of Paul. Epictetus, too, was learning to suffer and abstain, that he might, by word and action, show the sort of man the gods loved. And in the near future Marcus Aurelius stood, great as an emperor, greater as a philosopher, greatest as a man. Juvenal and Persius, too, were watching evil with keen eyes; and if satire or cynicism could have killed the Vices, those of this age had utterly died. But to paint virtue and scotch vice is not to create righteousness. Thought is noble only when it makes noble being; the ignoble living of an age is the saddest reproof of its noble teaching, because a testimony to its impotence. The moral system that pleases the reason, but does not exercise the will, debauches the conscience.

And the ancient moral systems showed the right, but gave neither the power nor the will to do it.

The contrast between the ideal and the actual in morals was sharp and strong. Here and there types of the ancient Roman virtue could be found, but virtuous individuals do not make a virtuous time; the stars shine bright in the darkest night, but they do not make light enough to chase its blackness away. The Nero who fiddled while Rome burned was the pupil of Seneca. The wicked emperors before and after Marcus Aurelius, — deified none the less that they were so abhorred, — made sad mockery of his pious meditations. The divine honours they received witnessed to the worst of all moral conditions — insensibility to the horror and shame of hideous and inhuman vice, with its invariable correlate, insusceptibility to the touch and inspiration of goodness and truth. Nothing is more significant of national character and condition than national amusements; find the pastimes of a people, and you will find what quality and spirit they are of. And throughout the Roman Empire there was nothing that amused like the amphitheatre. There thousands of men and women would gather to watch men fight with wild beasts or wilder men, often in pairs that could be counted by hundreds. The gladiator was the new hero of Rome, his brutal bravery the admiration of the city. The passion for blood so burned in the heart of Roman woman that she seldom spared the vanquished; the agonies of the dying added zest to the scene. If such was the sport, what must have been the earnest of the people? War, always brutal, was savage then; captives were either butchered in cold blood, or sold as slaves. Human life had no sanctity; if domestic economy required it, the child was exposed, the slave killed, or the troublesome relative poi-

soned. There are no records of crime and lust like the histories of the imperial families. Even religion was impure, human sacrifices were not unknown; the temples and the mysteries were scenes of debaucheries and sins for which our speech has, happily, no name. Imagine the tenderest of faiths and this hard and wicked age, face to face with each other, and does it not seem like a grim satire to say the pitiful faith was to prove mightier than the pitiless empire?

4. Alongside the moral, the religious state of the age must be placed; each corresponded to the other. The contrast of the ancient to the modern idea of religion has already been noted; personal conviction is essential to the modern idea, public observance was of the essence of the ancient. Make religion a thing of civil law, and the cardinal matter is conformity; personal conviction is secondary or unimportant. The man who does what the law requires of him is religious; the ordinance of man exhausts the claims of God. Make a legal statute the stay of religion, and religion is repealed; the act that makes it a civil institution abolishes its spiritual ideal. That might almost be said to be the thesis which the ancient religions were set to prove, and they proved it on the most stupendous scale. They showed how men, by conviction the most sceptical, could be as citizens the most pious, conforming to all the sacred customs, because they were civil institutions; how statesmen who denied and scorned all religion, yet supported it as a matter of national safety and law. Gibbon, in his ironical way, only speaks the truth when he says of this very time, "The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world, were all considered by the people as equally true, by the philosopher as equally false, and by the magistrate as

equally useful."* In so saying he but paraphrases the words of Varro, who divided theology into three kinds — mythical, physical, and civil — the first being specially adapted to the theatre, the second to the world, the third to the city.† What the philosopher thought of the gods, whether they were or were not, was his own concern; but, all the same, his duty as a citizen was to see that the worship of them was duly performed.

Where men so thought of religion, it was impossible that it could have any moral significance — be a comfort to the reason, or a joy to the heart. It was, indeed, utterly divorced from morality; godliness did not mean goodness; to be pious was not to be virtuous. The gods loved sacrifices, but did not care for moral obedience. The philosophers, not the priests, were the teachers of virtue. The schools, not the temples, were the guardians of morals. A

* *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. ii. "The policy of toleration" which he ascribes to "the Emperors and the Senate," "happily, seconded by the reflections of the enlightened and by the habits of the superstitious," Gibbon seems to imagine to have been produced and promoted by the reigning scepticism. No man could be blinder than he, especially if he did not want to see, or he would have asked how it happened that the ancient principle was reversed in England, where the most religious were also the most tolerant men. By asking this question he would have discovered why the sceptic was the man who least loved either toleration or liberty. In a note he says: "Some obscure traces of an intolerant spirit appear in the conduct of the Egyptians" (*Juv. Sat.*, xv.). [This is the famous satire where the people of Tentyra assail the citizens of Ombi for their worship of the crocodile.] Gibbon does not stand alone in so severely judging or rejecting Christianity (see Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. 315). Another side of the matter—the conflict between the authorities of Law and Religion, or the notions of empire and conscience—can be seen in Döllinger's *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, pp. 610–15.

† Varro, *Apud August., De Civitate Dei*, vi. 5. Augustine, who is rather critical of his authorities, explains *μῦθος* by "fabulous," on the ground that *μῦθος* originally meant "fable," and was best represented by *fabulare*.

religion without morality soon becomes an immoral religion; the religious emotions and sanctions, deprived of ethical quality and control, become the most debased and pernicious forces that can act within the spirit of man. So we are not surprised that Lucretius should have described religion as an oppressive burden to man, a monster of horrible aspect, which lowered upon mortals, and gave birth to abominable and unholy deeds.* Men as grave as Strabo could speak of the mythologies as bugbears invented to amuse childish people,† and men as brilliant as Lucian knew not what better to do with their wit than satirize the lying and knavery of religion.‡ So little was there

* *De Natura*, lib. i, 65.

† Geog. x. Strabo, the "squint-eyed," was in philosophy a stoic, and is spoken of by Plutarch as a philosopher (Zeller, *Griech. Philos.*, iv, 587 note). See his definitions in his account of philosophy which are pure stoicism, in the opening of Lib. i. Strabo inclined as a stoic to cast the mythology into a narrative of the creative process, and so it has been well said that he cast aside Euhemerus as "almost a proverb for mendacity" (Lib. ii, Falconer's Ed. pp. 139–140; Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, vol. i, p. 553. Ed. 1851). Yet as a geographer who tried to be an historian, he thought that he could, by removing extravagances and poetical licences and transcribers' mistakes, restore the myth to its original form and truth. Lib. i, which is mainly occupied with Homer, who is considered as the first (p. 10) of geographers, and their prince (Lib. xiii, p. 863), as well as poet and mythologist. It is not true, however, to say that Strabo thinks of Zeus simply as a man. The root of everything is his jealousy for God as infinite.

‡ Among the works which are here regarded is *De Morte Peregrini*, and I am half inclined to hold the satire as based on the study of the Ignatian history (Renan, *Les Evangiles*, pp. 493–4). The *Demonax* has, indeed, though for reasons I hold to be insufficient, been denied to be by Lucian (Bernays' *Lucian und die Kyniker*, pp. 104–5). *Alexander Pseudomantis*. The treatise is remarkable, not only for the portrait of the impostor, but also for the bringing forward of a Celsus, who is not Origen's foe. Yet on this point I would not be dogmatic, as many scholars who have studied the question closely hold the opposite opinion. (See Mosheim's Preface to the translation in German of Origen's κατὰ Κέλσου; Keim's translation of Celsus' *Wahres Wort*, pp. 275 ff.; Renan's view may also be seen in his *Hist. of the Origin of Christianity*, vols. v, vi, and vii). *Philopseudes*, or the incredulous man;

in it to invigorate or cheer, that Roman strength bent under the burden of existence; and men as philosophic as Pliny, the elder, doubting, despairing of all truth, sadly concluded that the greatest good reserved to man was "the power of taking his own life.*" Indeed, so depraved had the very conception of Deity become that the people were prepared to accord divine honours to the most wicked of men when powerful enough to set himself up for a god. We have but to compare such a use of the Divine name with what is possible now to see how far we have travelled since then; to see this, too, that a new notion of the Divine has been the main factor in the forward movement.

VII

1. We have now come to the point where we may watch the meeting of these two forces, so utterly unlike and so unequally matched — the doctrine of the Crucified, preached by the men of Galilee and the man of Tarsus,

and *Philopatris*, though the latter is not here regarded as really by Lucian. Harnack in his index calls Lucian "the mocker." Adolf Planck has an admirable and exhaustive paper on his relation to Christianity in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1851. Baur has an excellent sketch of him in his *Kirchengeschichte*, i, 409 ff., Eng. translation, vol. ii, pp. 167 ff. So also in his *Apollonius von Tyana*; cf. Keim, *Vorwort*. Renan, who frequently alludes to him, speaks of him in one note as more a "romancer than a historian of philosophy" (cf. Zeller's account of him, iv, pp. 820–1).

* xxxvi, 24. Gibbon has a paragraph in his famous chapter on Roman Law (xliv) dealing with its teaching on suicide, where he speaks of suicides as classed by Virgil among "the unfortunate rather than the guilty" (Æneid, vi, 434 ff). For the mediæval notion of suicide cf. Dante's *Inferno*, c. xiii, where the second round of his seventh circle takes him and his guide into the mystic wood, where the souls of self-murderers are imprisoned in stunted trees. The canto ends with a remarkable line: "Io fei giubetto a me delle mie case." The house must be interpreted as an allegory, which is with Dante a favourite form of speech.

and the Roman Empire, the colossal anti-Christ,* as it was termed, whose gigantic figure filled alike the earth and the sea.† Judged a priori, no enterprise was ever so extravagant, so altogether impossible of success, as the conflict of Christianity with Rome. Its preachers were men rude of speech, which was couched in an idiom foreign and provincial, offensive alike to the common and the cultivated ear. Their symbol was so abhorrent, their doctrine so incredible, that to expect a victory through belief seemed beyond the dreams even of a visionary. But, in this most illustrious case, fact was stranger than fiction. The rude men obeyed their Master, tried His doctrine and method, and triumphed. Nor had they to wait long for victory; it may be said to have been won by the men who marched in the van, by the first generation of preachers. Fanatical prejudice met them, and was overcome. In the city where their Master had been crucified, and where the hatred was intense enough to crucify themselves, they preached and prevailed. Persecution, indeed, drove them out of the city, but only that they might the better serve the cause it hated. And even Judea and Syria soon became fields too narrow for their ambition. They followed the scattered people of Israel, passed into the Grecian cities of Asia Minor, crossed to the islands, then to the mainland of Greece, and, finally, laboured in the cities of Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa. Scepticism, pride of intellect, immorality, idolatry met and persecuted them, but could not arrest their glorious career. The man of Tarsus was here the mightiest worker, making known to the men he best knew the Gospel he loved. Without weariness, without fear, unhasting, unresting, by force of reason, by appeals to the heart and conscience, speaking to the Jews as a Jew,‡ when he quoted

* 1 John ii. 18–22; iv. 3. † Rev. xii. 12. ‡ 1 Cor. ix. 20; Acts xiii. 14–16.

Moses and the prophets, but speaking to the Greeks as a Greek, where he quoted inscriptions on their altars and words from their poets,* he preached the truth he had received. And though sometimes called a "babbler,"† a man "beside himself,"‡ "mad,"§ "a mover of sedition,"‖ who "turned the world upside-down";¶ though his speech was despised as "rude,"** his presence as "weak," or "mean,"†† and his doctrine as "foolishness,"‡‡ yet he preached on, cheered by finding that even where least successful "some clave unto him,"§§ while in kindlier places "the Word of God grew mightily and prevailed."‖‖ And when, worn out with his living to Christ, he lay in a Roman dungeon, waiting "the hour of his departure,"¶¶ he could look on a multitude of churches lighting up with new splendour the shores of the storied Aegean, and even running like a belt of golden glory round the vast Roman Empire. As he thought of his weakness, yet looked at his work, there might well break spontaneously from his lips the words: "Now unto Him who is able to do ex-

* 1 Cor. ix. 21; Acts xvii. 22, 23, 28. With all its strangeness the method of the discourse on the Areopagus is strictly Pauline; note the part played by the men of Israel in the sermon at Antioch (xiii. 16) and the men of Athens here (xvii. 22); and note how little he can get under weigh without a text in either case, though in the one he quotes the Old Testament, in the other an inscription he has found on an altar.

† Acts xvii. 18. Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay translates Babbler by "ignorant plagiarists" (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 24). Passow, *sub voce*, σπερμολόγος, renders (α) a crow or rook as a bird who "picks up seeds"; then (β) a person who exists by doing the same, in places where seeds can be found in plenty, as in markets or beside altars; then (γ) it is said to mean "a poor, vulgar, common man," ignorant, talkative, wheedling, parasitic, slovenly, a vagrant rascal, who indulges his whim at the public expense.

‡ Acts xxvi. 24; 2 Cor. v. 13.
‖ Acts xxiv. 5.
** 1 Cor. ii. 1, 4; 2 Cor. xi. 6.
‡‡ 1 Cor. i. 18, 21, 23, 25.
‖‖ Acts xix. 20.
§ Acts xxvi. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 23.
¶ Acts xvii. 6.
†† 2 Cor. x. 10.
§§ Acts xvii. 34.
¶¶ 2 Tim. iv. 6.

ceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." *

2. But now this movement must in some way be measured, and its magnitude indicated. Bear in mind the starting point: the year A.D. 30 opens on the obscure, unknown Nazarene, the year 32 closes on His shameful and forsaken death. Twenty years later, in 52, the oldest Pauline Epistle is written; within the next six years Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans are composed; in about four more years their author dies. Before his death the Epistle of James had appeared; soon after it the first of Peter, the Apocalypse, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. In about twenty more years the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles of John have come to close the wondrous history, to show its cause, read its reason, and draw its lesson. Now, honestly face these facts, and ask, What do they mean? Look at the four great Pauline Epistles; only twenty-five years divide them from the dark moment of the Cross. It is easy to count the years, but can we, from the standpoint of religion and religious thought, measure the distance? Could we compute how far in the interval mind had travelled upwards in its estimate and interpretation of the Christ, whether the new religion could have been without it, or what by its divine energies have been achieved? Science loves to expatiate on the difference and the distance between the Ptolemaic and the Copernican systems. Can it calculate for us the space that divides Caiaphas' or Pilate's view of Jesus from the Pauline? or tell the difference the change from the one to the other has made to man? The change was not imaginative, but

* Eph. iii. 20, 21.

intellectual, not mythical, but rational, and did not simply affect the idea or person of Jesus, but the conception of the universe, of man, of history, and of God. The power of the movement lay in the infinite significance of this change; the secret that had from eternity lived in the bosom of the Father came forth and stood manifested in the Christ. To know Him was to know the last mystery of God, the infinite grace which was His glory and our salvation.

3. But the intellectual change is only one side of the matter; the moral and social was even greater. Study the mere facts. In the year A.D. 33 a few Galilean fishermen were seeking liberty of speech and worship in Jerusalem, and were hardly handled as poor and ignorant men. In the year that Paul died how did the matter stand? There were churches in Jerusalem, in Nazareth, in Cæsarea, in all Syria; churches in Antioch, Ephesus, Galatia, Sardis, Laodicea, in all the towns on the coast and throughout Lesser Asia; churches in Philippi, in Thessalonica, Athens, Corinth, in the chief cities of the islands and mainland of Greece; churches in Rome, in Alexandria, and in the Western Roman colonies. For the most part the churches were formed of poor men, but also of a few rich. In Rome, Cæsar's household had been reached, possibly, even kinsmen and kinswomen of his had been drawn into the Christian society. And one thing marked all these societies — the men they attracted experienced an extraordinary change of nature, which elevated their character and altered their temper and conduct and the tendency of their action. Look at the New Testament writings, think of the men who produced them, the circle whence they came, the age in which they lived. One was a physician — the author of the third Gospel, which bears his name, and the Acts — but

what were the others ? Matthew was a publican; Peter, James, and John were fishermen; Paul was a weaver of Cilician cloth; yet these men, and men such as these, produce a literature so morally pure, so delicate and refined, so mentally strong, so true and vivid in its history, so intense, exalted, universal in its religious thought and feeling, as to be by indefeasible right our most Sacred Book.

And as were the men, so were the churches they formed; they made societies like themselves; enforced on all a spirit and conduct akin to their own, and, considering the material on which they had to work, they succeeded in a remarkable, indeed, an altogether miraculous degree. And so in all the churches there was intense religious and intellectual activity. The apostles were not the only preachers; their disciples and converts became missionaries as well. Opinion was not uniform, but varied, diversified. Mind was agitated, exercised about the great facts and doctrines that had so suddenly taken possession of it, their relation to the man, to his old religion, to his new life, to sin, death, immortality, God. The profound problems raised by the new faith were discussed in all the churches; and through these discussions the Apostolic Epistles were shot like words of wisdom and of light. Every church became an epitome of society; all men were to be what every church was. It was simply a brotherhood; to be a member of one church was to be free to all, to be a Christian was to be a universal friend. The expansion in thought had its counterpart in the expanded life; men became as much more to man as God had become to him. The new faith was seen to create, wherever it came, a new mankind.

4. And now, why had the doctrine of Christ so wonderful a career? Why did it create in these few years so extraordinary a revolution? why did it achieve so remarkable

progress And why has it continued to be as it was at first? These are large questions not to be answered in a few concluding sentences. We speak not here of special endowments, common or miraculous gifts of the Spirit, but only of the normal agencies and methods of the primitive churches and their apostolic men. For one thing neither they nor their societies were burdened by any past; they made history, were not made by it. The Spirit of God was in them, and they obeyed it, certain that to serve the living present men must speak the truth of the living God. Then they were without official sanctities; for once in the history of man there was a religion without a priesthood; men speaking of God in reasonable words to reasonable men. The teacher was the man of knowledge; to ignorance there was given its natural rights, which were simply those of being silent and learning; to wisdom its natural duties, which involved the right to teach and to lead. There was no sacred caste, no rites too holy for the multitude; all the brethren were saints, all saints were brethren; and to the pure all things were pure, to the holy man all mysteries of God were open and free. Then the Gospel was preached, and the men who believed lived as they believed; by speech and life the new religion lived and moved. The supreme doctrine was the doctrine of the Cross; without it there was no word that saved. But it was never preached as a mere detached or isolated fragment; a visible point looking out of palpable darkness. Had it been so preached, it would never have prevailed. Let both the Gospels and Apostolic Epistles show how it was preached; it was set in living relation to the whole realm of thought, to the world of being and action. A centre, to be a centre, must have a circumference; the man who does not, now and then, make his people feel the

immense circumference of the truth, with all the lines radiating from the centre towards it, does not preach the Gospel. But the circumference, to be a circumference, must have a centre; and the man who does not stand in the centre, speak to all men and look at all things from it, is a man who will never feel or make others feel that there is any circumference whatever; will never see himself, or make others see, the beauty of the converging and radiating lines. Here, in the vital centre, the apostles stood, and their work was the splendid work we have seen; here, too, let us stand, coveting their spirit, emulating their zeal, imitating their methods, and we shall bear our part in making the kingdoms of the world, the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ.

II

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY*

I

THE nineteen Christian centuries that lie now almost completed behind us, form the most momentous chapter in the history of man, richer by far in all that makes for his good than the unnumbered centuries that went before. This pre-eminence they owe to the presence of the Spirit of Christ, which lives only as it works. It is that Spirit, and what it has attempted and achieved, that most and best distinguishes the modern from the ancient world, the new from the old civilization. Yet, though these centuries reveal in clear and indubitable fact the character and potency of the Christian religion, they have not exhausted its best possibilities, or called all its energies into play. They have been conditioned in their development by the churches. These churches are not the religion but its mightiest and most characteristic creation; and through them it has acted, and still acts, most directly on man and in history. They represent its being, and interpret its truth to the world, which judges the religion by the churches, not the churches by the religion. But the very best of them do not realize the ideal of Jesus; the most they can do is to make an attempt at it the less perfect the more it claims finality. In every church, as in every man, there

* Address from the chair of the Congregational Union, delivered at Sheffield in the autumn of 1883.

is a double self, each with its own life; the one is spiritual, descends out of heaven from God; and the other, which is at once formal and material, proceeds from man and is of the earth. What is achieved through the Spirit may be done by one church, but is the common possession and glory of all the churches; what is performed in the weakness and imperfection of the human conditions is, and remains, the church's own, evidence of the incomplete subordination of the society on earth to the Lord in heaven. The extraordinary thing is, not that the churches have so often fatally erred and disastrously failed in duty, but that they have been able, in spite of their errors and failures, so far to obey the Christ as to render service to man.

2. The churches of to-day have no easy task; never did God lay on men harder or graver duties. They inherit both the good and the evil, the honour and the reproach of the past. If history has its glory, it has also its shame, and no history has known brighter glory or darker shame than the history of the Church. And if we are proud of the glory, we are no less humbled by the shame. We dare not rejoice in evil, least of all when done or suffered by any member of the body of Christ. I would, were it possible, have our churches to feel the failings or sins of their sister churches, as if they were their own; and to feel concerning their own sins as if they were injuries or wrongs to their sisters. For these past, as for all present sins, by whatever church committed, we all suffer, whether we will or are unwilling; collective are so far like personal sins that they weaken our energies, hinder our efforts, create the passion or the prejudice that, unmoved, turns away from the most persuasive speech. I would have our churches to be jealous of nothing in any church save its

greater goodness and larger truth; to have no ambition but the ambition to excel in zeal for God and devotion to man. The pride that does not confess fault, does not own brotherhood, is deficient alike in ethical character and filial spirit. There is no man so much a sinner as the man who believes himself altogether a saint, and the church which most vaunts itself as infallible is the church which has most frequently and deeply fallen.

3. But to feel the evil of the past is to learn by it, and to be the better fitted to live and work in the present. The church ought to be the most progressive of all societies, foremost in every kind and province of good. Its place is not behind but before the times; it ought not to follow, but to lead the people and the State. And this obligation increases with age. Many Christian ideas have ceased to be the exclusive property of the church, and have become the common possession of the time; but in becoming such a possession the ideas have simply created the conditions that not only allow, but demand from all Christian communities the exercise of greater and higher activities. The more society improves the more possible it becomes for the churches to pursue nobler methods, and attempt vaster things. If they become mere conservative agencies, anxious only to maintain things as they are, then they abdicate their functions, prefer the real they can enjoy to the ideal they ought to seek to realize. A church is bound by the past only to excel the past, however noble it may have been; to be merely loyal to what has been is to be indifferent to what ought to be. It were better to have no history than to have even the most splendid if its years are to be but a succession of iron bands.

4. But the churches have not only to face the difficulties and responsibilities created by the past; they have also

to confront those peculiar to the present. They stand in relations to living thought and action that cannot but touch with concern all interested in the future of religion, and society, and man. For these relations are troubled, surcharged, indeed, with elements of collision and conflict, and he must be at once a blind and a sanguine man who neither sees the crisis nor feels the danger it brings. The responsibilities of the situation rest with the churches, not because they are solely or even mainly responsible for the creation of the present, but because they are altogether responsible for its issues. It is not enough, in these days, that a society has a large inheritance; it inherits from the past that it may the better fulfil its duties in the present, and it depends on its stewardship whether the inheritance be spared, and the society be honoured. Men's minds are not at this moment in a credulous or patient mood; they are critical and sceptical of all traditional beliefs, impatient of all conventional sanctities and honorary institutions. Yet this is a mood men of real beliefs and institutions of approved beneficence will not fear. He but ill understands Christianity who thinks that it is most honoured where least questioned, or that it has most power where men are most credulous. The days when its right to be was most sharply challenged were the days when it displayed the most victorious energy; and if the churches now be as dutiful, wise, and magnanimous as were the churches then, the result will not be different.

II

1. Now, I hope it will not be considered too large or too ambitious an undertaking, if I attempt from this chair, not to discuss, but to speak simply and seriously concerning

the relation of our Christian Churches and Religion to our Age. I feel profoundly the responsibility of venturing to touch so grave and vast a theme; I feel still more profoundly the responsibility which rests on all Christian men, and teachers, and churches. In this matter, then, we do not stand alone; all Christian bodies stand together, bound, possibly in spite of themselves, into unity, on the one hand by loyalty to their Master, on the other by their common duties to man. To be a Christian Church is to be the greatest of all societies, charged with the highest and most honourable of missions: the mission of interpreting God to man and of reconciling man to God. A church exists for the purposes of God as manifested in Christ, and must be judged in relation to those purposes; and by no other standard whatever. But if a church loses hold of God and of man, it loses hold of its end; therefore of its very right to be. Its truths are eternal, speak to the human heart everywhere; and, if it loses touch of the human heart, it is because it has lost possession or comprehension of its own truths. And a church void of living truth, bearing only dead dogmas in its bosom, what is it good for but to be buried out of the sight of man?

2. Let us begin, then, by noting this: While our subject is Christianity in the present, it cannot be discussed without reference to Christianity in the past. All really religious action, therefore, while done in time, has eternal relations and issues; we build on the past, but in the present and for the future. Our religion is a living thing, its history is a growth, the earliest ages live in the latest, augmenting their energies, conditioning their behaviour. An historical church is not the same thing as an historical Christianity; the latest and least historical of churches is, possibly, in a greater degree than the oldest, heir to

all that is historical in the religion of Christ. What belongs either to Catholicism or Romanism is the inalienable possession of the Church of Rome; but what in its history has been achieved by the truth and Spirit of Christ is the common property of Christendom, the inalienable inheritance of all its churches. There is, then, an historical religion, with which the religion of to-day stands organically connected, its product, yet not its culmination, a stage in the path of the eternal purpose that runs through the ages. This is something infinitely nobler than an historical church, for religion signifies the action of God within the limits and in the forms of time, working in all the churches, using the meanest and worst-designed agencies for ends far beyond and above themselves. Whatever is created by the truth of God and through His Spirit belongs to this religion; for it is but His eternalized action, the fruits of the life of God as realized in the spirit of man. It is confined to no Church, for the Spirit and the Truth were before the churches, and are within and above all. Its peculiar home is with the elect of God, the sons of holiness and light, who hear His Voice and obey His Will. They constitute the only true Catholic Church, invisible, spiritual, eternal; and the monument of their being in time is the history of the Christian religion.

III

Now, it is not possible to exhibit here the significance of the successive stages in the life of this historical religion. All that is possible is to select one or two salient points needed to explain and illustrate the work of religion in our own day.

1. The earliest history is still the richest in instruction

and inspiration. Of the Apostolic Age there has been speech already from this chair; and its lessons were simply emphasized by the sub-apostolic. Christianity and the Roman Empire were born together, the one at its birth the mightiest, the other the feeblest of human things. The founder of the Empire was the well-praised Augustus; of the religion, the crucified Christ. A century and half later, under the Antonines, in what a famed historian* has, with unconscious irony, called "the most happy and prosperous" period in history, the religion had its hardest struggle for existence. It was hated with the merciless hate the proud and strong have for the low-born and the weak; it was met and confounded by the coarse scorn and invincible prejudice of the vulgar and the ignorant; it was oppressed and mishandled by the absolute power which our famed historian described as "under the guidance of virtue and wisdom"; it was defamed by the lying malice of Judaism; it was mocked by the pitiless satire of Lucian, which might well have shamed modest truth into silence; it was exposed to the borrowed slanders, superfine criticism, and philosophic reasoning of Celsus; it was confronted and, on what seemed its own chosen ground, almost surpassed by the stoical calm and ethical elevation of Marcus Aurelius. Yet so vast were the energies the despised faith developed in the struggle that in another century and half the Roman Emperor was a professed Christian, and the Cross the symbol that floated from the Capitol.

And what were the victorious energies? Hate was met by love — a love that refused to fear the worst the persecutor could do, and refused to hate the persecutor for doing his worst. The love thus too strong to die before hate became the death of hate, subdued it into forbearance, if not

* Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. iii.

into gentleness. Coarse scorn was met by gracious ministries, service of the poor, help of the orphan, comfort of the widow, soft tendance of the diseased, sweet consolation of the dying. Bonds, imprisonment, and death were answered by meekness and obedience. Men the law unjustly handled, did the law honour by living blameless lives. Slander and mockery they met by pureness and sincerity; it was a noble boast of Tertullian's that the Christians were the only men condemned without crime and despised without reproach.* Criticism was answered by history and exegesis; philosophical argument by a new and nobler philosophy, which placed at the source of all things an eternal Father, bound humanity as a son to Him by an incarnate Redeemer, and which made all true thought and speech of man stand in glorious unity through the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. That philosophy was no system of abstract truth, fit only for the cultivated; but a very body of life, making the humblest feel as if the very secret of the universe had at last become articulate. And men who so believed — however lowly born — could live, think, and speak as grandly as Marcus Aurelius, while acting with a lofty magnanimity and large beneficence to which the sainted stoical Emperor never attained.† These were the forces that triumphed in that wonderful struggle. The victorious energies were

* There was no nobler or freer spoken apologist among the early Christians than Tertullian. He asks, Whether the Christian is committed to the flames—a punishment which was not inflicted on the sacrilegious, on the public foe, or even on the traitor—for freedom from crime, for his polity, for righteousness, for purity, for faithfulness, for truth? (*Ad Scapulum*, 4), which may be said to be an apology for Christianity based on the principle peculiar to the Christians to love those that hate them. See all Tertullian's early works; in particular the *Apologeticus* which contains authentic descriptions of the Early Church.

† See Thomas Gataker's—one of the most learned Grecians England can boast, and a member of the Westminster Assembly—edition of the *Meditationes*, and in particular his *Præloquium*.

not ecclesiastical, nor were they born of organization, marshalled and led by official authorities, but were spiritual, ethical, religious, begotten from above by the truth of God in the spirit of man. And the victory won by the religion secured for the religion the right to live, to work through human energies and under human conditions as the divine grace reigning unto righteousness.

2. With the victory of the religion, what it is the fashion to call "the Church" entered on a new phase — the *political*. It took corporate being, and stood first under the State, then alongside it, and finally over it.* The causes of this

* This is the only note which it is proposed to add to this address at this point, where almost every sentence requires what shall either confirm or modify or strengthen the thing said. This note is not intended for any such purpose, which were alien to the function of the address; but is designed simply to elucidate the historical statement which occurs in the above sentence. The Church is said to have stood first under the State; secondly, alongside it; thirdly, above it—relations that may as well be explained, since the term "church" has a different sense in each case. The first is the Church which under Constantine so stood under the State as to be dependent on it, i.e. he thinks of the new religion in the terms of the old, as similarly constituted with similar relations to the Empire and Emperor. As Eusebius informs us (*C.H.* x, 5–7, and in the *L.C.*—*εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου*—ii, 20–21, 24, 26, 35–36, 39–40, 44–45, 56; iii, 58, 63–65; iv, 18), a number of laws were passed which all implied that the new religion had superseded the old, such as that money was now granted to the clergy as it used to be to the old priesthood; temples were pulled down; churches were erected; the promotion of unity within the Church was held to be an imperial function; so was the calling of synods and other conciliar bodies; and it was the business of the Emperor to put down heresies and all strange opinions. While Constantine may as man have undergone the change we term conversion, yet there was no corresponding change in his relation as Emperor either to the religion or its institutions. The new was as the old; their relations to him and in consequence to the State were the same. The second ideal is different in type from the first, because the ideas as to Church and State differ. The Roman Empire with its Emperor has disappeared, and in its place the German has come. The person who represents the Church as well as the State is Charlemagne, and that great ruler has another idea of the Church than Constantine had, and consequently of the State. He is a

change, the need for it, the struggle by the greater of the Fathers against its consequences — these and such-like things do not here concern us. What we have to note is simply this: How and what the religion accomplished under these strange and encumbering conditions. It breathed a kinder spirit into the State, made the laws less cruel, gentler to the weak, more protective of the innocent. The brutal games were abolished, law threw a broader shield over women and children and helpless infancy, the slave obtained new rights, justice grew milder, and the more bestial sins were followed by more terrible penalties. And because of the life that worked in it the Church grew stronger, as the State grew weaker. Rome perished, but Christianity survived. In the dissolution of the old order the church alone lived, subdued and then absorbed the barbarians, and so became the centre round which the new order crystallized. The church that organized the new society became by right the regnant force, and remained so for centuries. The Roman or Latin church did well for Europe in those days; its supremacy was the supremacy of law, though of law as

more profoundly religious man, who has, as it were, in him more of Christianity, and has another notion alike of freedom and of religion. We may say, then, that the church now stood, partially by the pressure of its own upward ideas, emancipated from the old empire. The third form of the relation is that where the Church stands above the State, or, as is said in the text, "over it." Here the best expression is given by Gregory VII at Canossa, the famous fortress of the Tuscan dynasty, where the Emperor Henry IV came as a penitent. While Church and State in their respective orders and organizations may be conceived as thus related, it must not be imagined that when unity is thought to characterize both Church and State, it does so. John of Salisbury had advocated the principle *ecclesiastica debent esse liberima;* in his work on the Sacraments (lib. ii, c. 3), Hugo of St. Victor says, while Christ is the invisible Head of the Church, the *multitudo fidelium* remains the body; and the Pope is the vicar of Peter, placed in his seat by God, and so only God can judge him. Wycliffe, Hus, Nicolas de Clémangis, Johann von Wesel, and John Wessel, differed also from Rome.

administered by men who most err when they most claim to be above error. Its idea of law was a religious idea, born of the belief that God must have an order, and that this order must be revealed and realized in the Society that best expresses His will. Its idea of sin was also a religious idea, embodied in many a terrible form the conviction that to man the last calamity was to be in conflict with the law and nature of God. Its notion of salvation was a religious notion, a crude manner of saying that the supreme need of man was to be in holy and happy harmony with God's will. In allowing birth no legal place within the church, in opening its highest places to the ambition of the lowliest born, it proclaimed the equality of Christian manhood. By its religious houses it declared that religion was the supreme thing, that the man most possessed of divine truth was the holiest man. By the arts religion cultivated, and the cultivation alike of nature and mind thus spread, toil was made honourable, art spiritual, industry fostered and ennobled. Through the mighty system-builders — men like Anselm and Peter the Lombard, Duns Scotus and Aquinas — it exalted the search for truth and the life of thought, showing by the reverence that was paid him that the schoolman was greater than the warrior, wielded a vaster and more abiding power.

Men often say, "In those days the church ruled mind," meaning thus to condemn both ruler and ruled; but it were truer to say, "Mind ruled the church, and when mind ceased to rule the church the church ceased to rule man." What it did it did not by virtue of its organization, but in spite of it, by virtue of the truth it carried, the spirit that dwelt in its nobler sons and distilled through its multitudinous members into the common life of man. A church that owns men so possessed and inspired of largest love as

Bernard and Francis of Assisi, so saintly as Tauler and Thomas à Kempis, so compact of faith and imagination as Dante and Fra Angelico, is a church that through its godly men and its godliness is owned of God. Where beautiful saintliness has been realized, divine guidance has not been denied. Yet, much as religion did in and through the political church, that church did one splendid, though negative, service to religion — it proved on the most stupendous scale that a political society, though organized and administered by the wit of man, can never be the city of God. Rome was neither in her imperial nor ecclesiastical days a city of saints, crime did not disqualify for office, or displace from power; the highest crown came not seldom to the greatest and most impenitent sinner. But a system that allows rewards to the guilty is no religious system; religion may act through it, but it is not a religion. Its ecclesiastical worldliness is its own; though its spirituality is of God. As I said before, so I say again, the first belongs without dispute to Rome; the second is the inheritance of all the churches.

3. Against this ideal of religion, and its too faithful realization in the organized sacerdotal and political Church, a revolt was inevitable. Reason recoiled from the ideal, conscience protested against the reality, and the result was the Reformation, which fitly came in the days of the person Carlyle terms the "elegant pagan Pope," Leo X. That event was no mere reaction against an exhausted and tyrannical system; it was a noble and successful endeavour to find a more excellent way. By it Christian truth got nearer to man, and man nearer to it, and so new elements of the religion were relieved not simply for the creation of a higher manhood, but also for incorporation in a better society. Sin was so terrible a thing that no

man or church could deal with it, only God could; salvation was so great a thing that it must be a divine work through and through. The more directly God and man stood face to face, then the more sovereign, yet paternal, God became, and the worthier, the nearer in dignity to Deity, grew man. Religion became more spiritual, more a matter of the conscience and reason, bringing God into the conscience, reconciling the reason with the Eternal.

And so at the same moment, and by the same act, religion became the source at once of order and freedom, nay, freedom was order, because obedience to the law which was revealed to reason, but interpreted and enforced by conscience. Hence came a larger and higher view of life, liberty was necessary to it, and not simply civil liberty, but religious as well. And so there came wars of an altogether new and strange sort — not for conquest or patriotism, but for the right to worship God as the reason knew Him, and the conscience honoured Him, and the heart loved Him. The battle for this freedom is not yet ended, though to the long-assured victory there is no more needed the noise of the warrior and the garment rolled in blood. In gaining it we gain the condition most necessary to the highest things. Bondage depraves, slaves are proverbial for their vices; to be his best and most virtuous, man must be free. Religion without freedom is not religious, no truth of the reason, no concern of the conscience, no joy of the heart, no life for the exercise and ennoblement of the spirit of man. Till this freedom was won reformed Christianity could only develop its sterner side; but once the victory was assured, the gentler graces came to mix with and soften the severer virtues. And so the older Puritan made possible, nay, in process of time he became the newer philanthropist, i.e. a man who lived for humanity, creating or administering the beneficent agencies

that lessen human sin, lighten human sorrow, make the earth happier to man, and lovelier before God.

4. But freedom had not only to be won, it had to be used; and the wise use of it does not come by nature. It has to be learned; experience teaches, exercise is education. Reason, free, turned to ask religion, "What right have you to be? What are you? and what is necessary to your being?" Hence came the problem of the eighteenth century, and the system which is called on its subjective side Rationalism, and on the objective Deism. In the history of our faith, this system had a function and consequently a place. Reason wished to know whether objective truths were necessary to religion. Could religion not survive the denial of those elements that either transcended or seemed to contradict experience? As these elements denied left nothing distinctively Christian, the question rose — might it not be possible to construct a religion by a logical or ratiocinative process? Nay, must not the one so constructed be the religion of religions, which underlies all, and is in all concealed; for it is Nature's own creation, the fittest worship for the Spirit? On these points the eighteenth century made its immense experiment, tried in its shallow way to rationalize Christianity, but found that it died in the process; then tried to evoke the religion of nature, but found that it would not be evoked, was indeed not there to answer, had never existed, and could by no manner of persuasion be made to exist. Religion as transcendental was a creation of God, due to His action in time, indeed His highest work in and through the Spirit. Where history is fullest of God, the creative force is mightiest, and the creative result highest. And so the Son who declared the Father was needed to perfect religion in humanity. His appearance was its becoming. It is real only as it is objectively true; deny its objec-

tive truth, and it becomes a dream of heaven to one age, but an illusion of sensuous childhood to another, and still later a simple lie meant to gladden an otherwise hopeless age. Religion to be real must not be built out of the reminiscence or anticipations of a nature struggling Godward; but must descend from God to man, that it may lift man to God. The century that made this evident did a needed work: showed once for all that the religion which is not alive with Deity is for man no living religion.

5. It is necessary that we think of the Christian religion which did a specific work in each age, as living under varied forms during those ages, entering in each more completely into the life of man, and creating the conditions in him that allowed a freer, and higher, and fuller development in it. When we so think, we conceive religion, not the church which is its mere vehicle, as the great factor of his progress, his wealth, virtue, happiness; yet as creating these only that it may evolve the energies that shall be creative in a still higher degree. The continued progress of man, then, depends on the increasing power of his religion, and it is only through its past that one can understand its present and forecast its future. But to complete our idea of its past, it is necessary to remember one thing: its mightiest achievements are not outer, but inner, spiritual, personal. And to estimate what it has done we should know what it has been to all the individuals who have believed and lived by it. Religion guides the course of history only as it inspires the lives of men, and it is because the Christian religion has done so much for persons that it has been so mighty for good to the collective race. An analysis of the contributions Christianity has made not only to the sum total of human happiness, but to the conditions necessary to its being, is not possible; simply

because its most characteristic contributions have been not beneficent ideas, laws, institutions, but living men, made happy themselves, and inspired by an enthusiasm for human happiness and good. The persons are indeed possessed by the ideas, which they not only embody, but obey; and so are made at once obedient to the laws and creative of the institutions; but these are the means of man while men themselves are means employed of God. His beneficence creates our benevolence, that through it His own high purposes may be fulfilled. And consider how potent the Christian religion has been in making man into a means for the ends of God. It has made man conceive the universe, not as the seat of a dark fate, or cold necessity, or impersonal law, but as the home of a gracious God, who made and who loves all. As Coleridge said in the *Ancient Mariner:*

> "He prayeth best who loveth best,
> All things both great and small;
> For the dear God who loveth us,
> He made and loveth all."

It has, too, made the misery of man a pain to God, and so its cure the sacred duty of all the godlike; the happiness of man is the joy of God, and so its increase the function of all active godliness. It has, besides, deepened, almost created, the sense of sin, and has intensified the sympathy with sorrow till it has become almost too painful to bear; but only that men may the more hate and avoid sin, the more help and relieve sorrow. It has, also, created new virtues, sweeter humanities, nobler and wiser philosophies; which have dignified man, surrounding him, however humbly placed, with an almost infinite significance; and which have exalted conscience, given to reason its most sacred rights, and claimed for liberty its cardinal place.

But the mere analytical handling of the Christian religion

can never disclose its wealth, or show how it has enriched the spirit of man, enlarged and perfected his life. To see and know these things the religion must be studied, not in the abstract, but in the concrete; not in its institutions, but in the persons possessed of its living truths. Greater than Christian churches are the Christian men, who are to be found not in Councils or Synods, not in Colleges of Cardinals or Houses of Convocation, lower and higher; but only in the Society of Christ where He is most fitly or fully seen, in the conscience He has pacified and purged from its guilt, in the heart He has soothed in its sorrow and sweetened into holy resignation, in the character He has formed to deeds of nobleness and sacrifice, in the spirits for whom He has changed the shadow of death into the sunrise of immortality; in a word, in the men He has made friends of their kind, enthusiasts for goodness, truth, and freedom. The making of these men, and the consequent working the works they have accomplished, are the supreme achievements of the Christ in History. Through them it has been a record of human progress; their lives have exhibited the action of God in humanity. The more they have multiplied, the humaner has grown the spirit and the nobler the ideals of man. And this progress has proved that the ideal immanent in the race is one with the ideal active in the religion, and the more its activity is manifested the more apparent becomes the correspondence between the two ideals. What the Creator meant man to be, man becomes through the religion of Christ, and this agreement of idea and fulfilment is explicable only through the identity of their source. The religion comes to be that the idea involved in the creation might be evolved and turned into an ideal realized.

IV

1. Now, this hurried glance at the historical progress and action of the Christian Religion brings us directly face to face with our proper question — what is its relation to this age, what its work in it, and how this work is to be done. It is not my purpose to use history as an apology for our religion, or vindication of its right to be. Its achievements in the centuries behind us can never, taken alone, be an adequate reason for claiming for it or conceding to it control over the century in which we live. The right of Christianity to be must be sought not in its achievements, but in its capabilities; not in what it has done, but in its capability of doing. It must, like force or energy, be a power capable of doing work. This, and nothing less, is worthy of it; if it could speak, no smaller plea would it allow to be urged in its name. To live by retrospect is at once the privilege and the proof of age, seemly where active life is over, because evidence alike of what has been and what is. To live in deed and endeavour is the sign and duty of manhood; what alone becomes quick reason and unexhausted energies. To have served man constitutes a claim on his gratitude; to be able to serve him even better than he has yet been served, constitutes a claim on his faith and obedience. And this is the claim that in the face of this nineteenth century we make in behalf of our religion. If it be but a monument of past service whose good has all been incorporated in that mighty entity called the Race, I have no wish to see it live; but if it is the home and centre of the healthiest, highest, and happiest energies that still work in humanity, then it ought to live and affirm its right to live, that humanity may be saved.

Here, then, is our position: Christianity is full of un-

exhausted energies, of latent and undeveloped capabilities, fitted to meet the deepest and most clamant wants of the day. The development of these energies and capabilities has been made possible by the course and progress of the past; their exercise is made necessary by the needs of the present. These needs Christianity has helped to create, in order that by satisfying them it might make man more thoroughly and perfectly Christian. In the present I hear only a deep call to our religion to be true to itself and do the work God sent it to perform; in the past I see only a slow growth into the wisdom and strength that the better qualifies it to respond. From the Church of the Apologists and Martyrs we must learn to wed thought to action, to think nobly if we are to live bravely and well, to live purely if we are to understand our faith, to honour it and make it honoured. The best apology for it is not offensive criticism; it is construction. We do but poor service if we simply demolish a rival system; but the greatest possible service if we add a living stone to the temple of truth. From the organized political church we learn that religion has to do with everything, and ought to pervade and govern the State, penetrate and affect all laws, reach and benefit all classes, regulate and inspire all lives; but we also learn that the political ideal will never accomplish this, will accomplish only the very opposite, turn religion into worldliness, and make the church the playground of the hungry and the ambitious. From the Free Churches we learn that religion must be free, a matter of the spirit, impossible without personal conviction, real only as the conviction is real. From the eighteenth century, which we regard as the age of apologetics, we learn that the truth of the matter believed is necessary to the reality of the belief and its control over the life; that to be without knowledge of God is to be

without religion, and where the knowledge is fullest and purest the religion will be most perfect and authoritative.

2. But it is not enough to be enriched by the lessons and experience of the past; they enrich us only that we may the better do our work in the present. Our fathers were in many respects greater than we, greater as theologians, scholars, ecclesiastics, possibly, too, as men; but in one vital respect our day differs from theirs in being more complex; it has a vaster variety of elements in its life, more radical problems in its thought. The questions — religious, intellectual, moral, social, political, and ecclesiastical — that rise and demand solution, and demand it from religion, if religion is to continue to live — exceed in multitude and in difficulty anything the older and simpler times knew or could have conceived. In dealing with these questions the most heroic is the wisest way — it ought to be shown that the best solution is to be found in religion. The religion which comes from God must be able to satisfy the whole man; the complications of the most complex life ought not to be too much for it. To be silent about the things that most concern man, is to renounce the right to lead him. Men cannot help themselves, they simply must ask their questions, whether religion answers or no; and they will take the best solution they can find, and make of it a faith or — a fetish. Religion has the answer, but the answer it has must be given through the churches and the men who are their interpreters. They stand between religion and the age, and have duties to both, and must be loyal to both, not sacrificing either to the other, leaving the age ignorant of religion or religion dumb and impotent before the age. But before a man can interpret religion, bring out all its infinite significance for mind and life, he must allow religion to take possession of his spirit, so to

penetrate and pervade him by its mighty energies and truths, that it shall be to him an inspiration and he be for it a prophet. If there are men who know both their age and their religion, the age and the religion are certain to be made to know each other. Give us men who can interpret the speech of God, and we shall find it the completest answer to the deepest questions of man.

V

But from the religion in the past and its problem in the present, we must now advance to another point — the Attitude of the Age to the Religion. Here it would be easy to speak in terms whether hopeful, critical or despondent, as to the *Zeitgeist*, the mind, temper and tendency of the times; but it will be better to make the attempt to be within our narrow limits analytical and judicial.

1. It must be confessed that the religious spirit of the day is earnest, active, philanthropic, missionary. The severest critic, were he also honest and just, could not say less. He might say that its zeal was narrow, unenlightened, often sectional and bitter, ill-advised as to means, and not wise in its ends; but he could not question its reality. Nor can its beneficence be doubted; the philanthropy of to-day is, happily, far from altogether religious, but it remains in the main what it has been. Its springs are in the churches; its apostles and ministers are the men they make. Missions, too, home and foreign, are abundant; it is manifest that all churches are possessed of the belief that Christianity is still able to save souls. The evils of the times are many, and lie on the surface; any fool can see them, and may well be wise enough to reprove them. The sects are multitudinous; their spirit is exclusive and fierce — nay, even cruel; yet the passion of intense sin-

cerity is a nobler thing than the cynicism of indifference or the superfine disdain that can only despise zeal for the truth, not understand it. Conventionalism, the worship of the established and the customary, the profession that is saved from being hypocrisy only by being innocently unconscious of any reality to be professed — these, and such like, are shameful, as all shams are; but there is something worse than Pharisaic respectability. There is Pharisaic vice, guiltiness avowed and ostentatious. Manners that are only manners, and not ways and modes of a noble spirit, are poor things; but at the worst good manners must always be better than bad. There are sins enough of religious men and communities to reprove; unveracities, infidelities, uncharitableness, jealousy of another's good, glorying in another's evil, devotion to the knight-errantries rather than to the patient and fruitful husbandries of beneficence; but the man who thinks and speaks of these as if they were the heart and whole of living religion, is like a man who should declare he could not see the sun for his spots, or who should mistake the nod of Homer for the measure and movement of his verse.

2. In spite of its sins and shortcomings, the religious life of to-day is strong and good, full of purpose and high endeavour. On the practical side especially, it is worthy of praise. Imagine a Roman, who in the first century had watched the beginnings of Christianity, come back to see how it looked and lived in the nineteenth: a Tacitus, let us say, because he had a pen that could bite even in describing what he saw. He brings his strong moral sense, his hatred of lying and deceit, his scorn for the pomp that clothed, but could not hide, the mean and treacherous soul, his insight into men and movements, his desire, not simply to describe events, but to know their causes.

He finds that to him the savage is more intelligible than the civilized; the modern English harder to understand than the ancient Germans; but, by-and-by, to his observant eye and analytic intellect and clear judgment, things become lucid, ordered, explicable; though to find their causes he has had to traverse the eighteen centuries that divide his own day from ours. And we may conceive him speaking somewhat thus:

"Events do not always verify the judgment of the historian, and the man nearest to a thing may, even though he claims to be an historian, understand it least. Posterity, if I may so describe this terrible English people, has accepted my reading of the imperial history, and judges the emperors, — their crimes, their follies, their arbitrary violence, their frightful ingratitude, — very much as I have taught it. Men see, too, that I read the meaning of those Germans rightly; if the Romans had only learned the lesson, the history of the world might have been so different! But in one thing I committed a tremendous mistake. I do not see how I could have judged otherwise, yet history has been one immense falsification of my judgment. I thought the religion of Christ an execrable, a "detestable superstition"; and now I find it the religion of the civilized world, a world that is more civilized than our own, and it is the cause of the peculiar civilization. The moral purity of the religion is extraordinary. These churches are not like our temples; their worship is not made an occasion of lust and a cloak for sin; they are the best schools of morals, men are made good in them, taught to be just and free citizens, to live benevolent and beneficent lives. Indeed, this religion and these churches seem to be the moral heart of this people, the source and spring of all their good. What is so unlike our old Roman life

and ways as to be unintelligible to me only becomes intelligible when looked at through this religion. These English think of foreign peoples as we never did — as men, as brothers, as persons they would like to believe and live as they do; to be rich and cultivated as they are. Possessing within themselves every good men need desire, they yet send out men to teach their God to the veriest savages. Our gods were our own, as was our religion; but this God and religion for everybody has created a sense of human brotherhood and made all men feel brothers. Then, here, I miss our Roman games: the gladiator is unknown; men do not fight with wild beasts, or with each other, unto wounds and even death, for the public amusement and at the public expense. On the contrary, statesmen do not amuse people; they instruct them, build schools and colleges, create universities, libraries, galleries, appeal to reason, and rule by help of the reason to which they appeal. Here, too, I perceive the influence of the religion; its spirit of gentleness will not allow men to feel amused with blood and death; and its spirit of humanity makes it so respect and regard men that it wishes no man to be killed, and every man to be taught. Then, too, there are no slaves here; man is free. The proudest noble, the mightiest senator, the very sovereign, dare not lay violent hands on any one, or, like our patricians, throw their servants to feed their lampreys. Law is queen, and all men are equal before it; and all, save the lawless and criminal, are by it made free. Here, too, the religion has been at work; where men become brothers they can be slaves no more. War, I find, is still common; has even become far more terrible in its implements and scale of destruction, though this makes it less frequent and wasteful of life. Yet here even the same beneficent spirit has been active; the victors do not kill

their captives, or sell them into slavery; they protect them rather; enemies respect each other's dead, and agree to help the wounded without respect of persons or armies. Indeed, the benevolence of this modern world surprises me; the spirit of philanthropy seems universal. We exposed our children, thankful to have so simple and efficient a means of practising domestic economy; here they build hospitals for the foundling and the outcast. We thought life a burden to be borne only so long as agreeable; but here they hold suicide a sin, connivance at it a crime; suffering they seek to soothe, weakness to nurse, building for those too poor to command comfort those places called infirmaries, where skilled men and ministering women wait to serve the sick and heal the diseased. It is altogether wonderful to me, and would be unintelligible were it not for this religion which I once so much despised. It has worked so extraordinary a change in human nature that it hardly seems the nature of the same humanity. This is indeed a thing above nature, as we understood it, above even the gods, as we understood them. A God higher than our highest must, through this "detestable superstition," as I deemed it, have entered into manhood that He might do, what He evidently is doing, make an altogether new mankind."*

VI

But for us the standard of comparison is not Rome in the Tiberian or Neronian age; it is the ideal of our religion. That is an easy virtue which is satisfied with excelling the past; that virtue alone is brave which judges itself by

* If one wants to know what Tacitus thought of this "exitiabilis," this fatal or deadly "superstitio," one must read his own words as written in the Annals, xv, 44.

perfection, and is, by the judgment, braced to attempt better things. The overheard reflections of a Roman, suddenly confronting a world he imperfectly understands, might easily become a soothing and delusive song — a fatal thing to men whose warfare is not accomplished; hardly, indeed, well begun. So we must look at our age with our own eyes, and compare it not with what was in a distant past, but with what ought to have been; and, were we allowed to speak of possibilities, with what would have been had the churches been equal to the religion of Christ. The whole field is far too immense to be here surveyed, and so we must confine our attention to one or two points of primary significance.

1. There is the attitude of the cultivated and intellectual classes to the Christian religion. I will not say that it moves me either to alarm or despondency; but it does fill me with anxious sympathy and concern. It were a mistake to imagine that these classes are, either as a body or as regards their larger proportion, estranged from Christianity. They are not. We cannot forget — it would be wrong if we did — that the two greatest living names in English literature are the names of poets conspicuous, not simply for their reverence, but for their service to religion; and so long as Alfred Tennyson and Robert Browning live, it dare not be said that either the intellect or the culture of England has broken with faith. And they do not stand alone. A great number of the most eminent men in science, in philosophy, in letters, in art, and in education are men distinguished by the most sincere and simple-minded piety. But many are deeply and frankly estranged. Some are known mainly because of the candid way in which they have declared their estrangement; others have made themselves famous by the skill with which they have used their

science, or criticism, or art to discredit religion. To name names were invidious; the tendency — which was more common in the eighteenth than even in the nineteenth century — is still too common a characteristic of our day to call for detail. The most distinctive and authoritative English philosophy is an Agnosticism which, on the most favourable interpretation of it, makes God dumb; and leaves man standing before Him a puzzled, perplexed, and unsatisfied inquirer. The two leading scientific doctrines, the Correlation of the Physical Forces and Evolution, have been used as forms and occasions of polemic against theism by certain persons who are among, if not the most eminent, yet the most widely known, whether physicists or naturalists. Literary criticism has been made the vehicle of a most unbelieving and often cynical spirit; through the men and systems of the past, the men and faith of the present have been most cunningly assailed. Art in becoming pre-Raphaelite is tending to become monotonous and unspiritual; its idealism but sensuous sentiment; its realism, sickly passion; its classicism, emasculated imitation, most false, where it ought to be most true. They say, "Art has no concern with morality," but they forget while admiring the fine naturalism of classical art, to remember the noble morality of the men that made the art classical. And so our modern æstheticism which is but pseudo-classicism, knows not how to be sacred and spiritual, but only how to be profane and sensuous; when it essays to depict the holiest persons and scenes, it but pains by its gross and grotesque realism. All this indicates, I will not say the disaffection of the cultivated spirit to Christ, but certainly widespread estrangement. Society approves what it could not bear were it sensitive in conscience and reverent in heart. The atmosphere

around it is becoming less favourable to belief; religion is losing its old sanctity, because without its old supremacy. The society where a man becomes rather more of a favourite and a hero for his aggressive belligerency or finely-salted satire against religion can hardly be called a religious society. And who will say that it is otherwise with what is esteemed the cultivated society of England?

2. This state of matters occasions me, I have said, grave concern; yet less concern than regret. I care little indeed about frivolous fashion; it will always come and go according to the ruling spirit of the time, and its religion or irreligion will be a very small matter. But I do deeply care for what it may indicate, the lapse of noble and commanding spirits from the Christian faith. The loss of such spirits is to be altogether regretted. The men and the faith alike suffer; it would ennoble them, they would adorn it, and increase immensely its power for good. There are men now living concerning whom, were the wish of Paul ever a becoming or a holy wish, it might be allowed to say, "For their sakes I could wish myself accursed from Christ."* To trace their unbelief to pride of intellect, or to any save an honourable cause, is to do them grievous wrong.

Yet there they stand, estranged in intellect and conscience from the faith of the centuries. And how are they to be reconciled? The how, indeed, is as hard to find as the need of reconciliation is obvious. No religion can afford to lose choice spirits, least of all can the Christian. It has done too much for them, owes too much to them; they are too able to serve it to be spared. In the past it has enlisted and made them, as it were, its van and rear-guard. The great minds of the Christian centuries have been Christian minds. When the religion began its aggressive course,

* Rom. ix. 3.

each side could claim noble intellects; on the heathen side stood Seneca, Plutarch, Epictetus, Tacitus, Pliny, Juvenal; on the Christian, Peter, Paul, John, and their fellow-workers. So far as mere trained intellect is concerned, Heathenism is an easy first, but not in the influence that shaped later generations. Here either Paul or John overtopped all who stood against them; and the balance has never been so even since; for it turned swiftly and bent deeply to the religion, and has inclined to it till now. In the second century Marcus Aurelius, Lucian, and Celsus were, to say the least, outweighed by Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus. In the third century, the ascetic and speculative genius of Plotinus and the critical intellect of Porphyry touched with sunset glory the eventide of paganism; but the brightening dawn of the Christian day was proclaimed by the eloquence of Tertullian, the learning of Origen, the statesmanship of Cyprian. In the fourth century intellect had deserted the old religions; Julian, Libanius, and their host of obscure rhetors but form a background that throws into the more marvellous brilliancy the galaxy of contemporary fathers, men like Athanasius, Eusebius, Basil, the Gregories, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Lactantius, Jerome, Augustine. These were the men of the century; their presence on the Christian side proved the hopelessness of Julian's apostacy; to the faith they represented imperial edicts were but the sound and fury that signify nothing. From that hour to this intellect has been Christian; we have but to cite to prove it names as typical of mediæval genius as those of Anselm and Abelard, Peter the Lombard and Albert the Great, Aquinas and Duns Scotus; or as representative of the sixteenth century, as those of Erasmus and Luther, Reuchlin and Calvin, Melanchthon and More, Cranmer

and Le Fevre; or of the seventeenth, as Shakespeare and Milton, Cromwell and Hampden, Gustavus Adolphus and Jacob Boehme. Even the century that might seem the great exception to our thesis, the eighteenth, was none, for while the men who made most noise in their own day were infidel, the men who exercised the deepest and most abiding influence were not. No man was so feared, read, spoken about as Voltaire: but who reads or cares about him to-day? At the opening of the century stands Leibnitz, at its middle Butler, at its close Kant, and were there three mightier names in it, or names fuller of living and quickening spirit?

Christianity has, then, a sort of hereditary claim on the foremost intellects of time, owes to them gratitude, feels for them love. They have served her, have helped her to serve man, been the chosen vehicles of her profoundest and most plastic influences. And living intellect needs the religion; it is full of disquiet, of yearnings after the Infinite it derides. Its cynicism, its scorn, its bitter humour, its irony, are all born of discontent. Its art is the very apotheosis of sadness, of sensuous desire too indolent and weary to be honest passion. Its characteristic philosophy becomes progressively sadder; in Mr. Herbert Spencer's *First Principles* there is a glow as of religious enthusiasm; in the *Principles of Sociology* only a wearisome analysis of matters that never existed in the realms of history and of mind. The men who have broken with faith feel in their best moments sadder, almost inclined to turn back into their yesterdays in search of the faith and hope they have lost. One who comes of a noble spiritual stock, whose delicate raillery of the English Philistine — the man over-zealous in religion — is but inverted admiration of the Puritan, has allowed us to hear "the eternal note of sadness" that comes to him as on

Dover beach he looks at the calm sea, watches the full tide and the moon that "lies fair upon the Straits," and thinks,

"The Sea of Faith
Was once, too, at the full, and round earth's shore
Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furl'd.
But now I only hear
Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar,
Retreating, to the breath
Of the night-wind, down the vast edges drear
And naked shingles of the world."

The heart as well as the imagination speaks there; that is poetry touched with emotion, the sorrow that comes of a loss too great to be repaired by any gain. In its deep and growing sadness, the cultivated spirit seems to ask — who will show us a force strong enough to draw the tide from its ebb to the full that it may clothe the naked shore and throw its soft yet sheltering embrace round our hearts and lives?

3. But a matter of even greater concern is the attitude of the industrial and labouring classes to religion. Their attitude becomes to me the gravest of all reproaches to the churches of England, the most significant example of misunderstood duties and neglected responsibilities. Our religion was born in poverty; its sympathies and associations were with the poor. The Master laboured with His own hands, and the "common people heard Him gladly." Its apostles were workmen; it drew its earliest recruits from the men who toiled. The change it worked in the world was accomplished from below, through the elevation of the masses, not by the action of kings. But what marks the religion of our day is the loss of the masses. Their estrangement is more general and, I will add, more deplorable than that of the cultivated, for the Churches are more directly responsible for it. Yet not all in an equal

degree. The Church of Rome, at least in the British Isles, holds its poor; and the Methodists have in certain of our districts and among certain classes achieved wonders. But, taken throughout, the English working-man has too largely ceased either to go to church or to be a religious person in any tolerable sense. He seldom attends church or chapel; he does not admire, often cordially despises, the parson; he thinks religion helps him but little in the struggle for life; he thinks it hinders him rather, being mostly on the side of privilege and capital. He may not be a pronounced secularist, but he strongly believes that a religion which is not good for this life cannot be good for the next; that what is not openly and strongly for justice and freedom and against oppression cannot be of God and the truth. His battle for his rights and liberties has been mainly his own; and, while many of the men who have helped him have been loudly anti-Christian, too few Christian men have dared to apply religion to his problems and his conflicts. Everything has encouraged the tendency of mind thus begotten: the rapid growth of large cities has been fatal to simplicity of life and mind, the action of the immense factories and workshops has been to create monotonous uniformity, to repress individuality, to prevent or blight the culture of the home. Amusements have been too much left to the tavern, houses have been so built as to make comfort, at times even decency, hardly possible; and for long education was too rare and too poor to leave the mind anything but an uncultivated blank, or, at best, a congenial home for weeds. But, whatever the causes, there the fact stands, a large proportion of our working and labouring classes are either indifferent to religion or opposed to it. I dare not venture on the percentages, they are so immense as to seem simply incredible; but what-

ever they are, they ought to call the churches to earnest searchings of heart for past neglect and strenuous attempts at present duty.

To attempt to speak one's regret were vain; it is too deep for speech. The typical English workman has many noble qualities, he is plain-spoken, straightforward, in the best sense veracious, with an innate love of justice that makes him almost by nature the friend of the wronged and downtrodden. He is not like the gifted youth of the clubs, sceptical of all good, airily indifferent to truth, cynical to men who have convictions, scornful of sincerity or enthusiasm as of a thing "in bad form"; but he is a convinced man, with beliefs he holds strongly and states roundly; certain, whatever his theology, that a man ought to stand by the truth, that a mean man can come to no good, that principle ought to rule and justice be impartial. To leave such natures unpenetrated by religion is to do them grievous wrong; it is to leave without its best blessing the land that owns them. To possess her sons of industry, to make of them the best possible — that, and nothing less, ought to be the ambition of every church in England.

VII

What, then, ought to be the attitude and behaviour of our religion, or rather the churches which represent and interpret it, in the face of these features and tendencies of our age? We shall attempt to deal with the question as it relates first to the cultivated, and next, to the industrial classes.

I

1. The attitude of the cultivated, with all its various phenomena, social, literary, ethical, æsthetic, is the expres-

sion of a broad and strong intellectual movement or tendency, what we may call a heathen revival. The terms are not used to convey reproach, but simply to characterize and distinguish. The endeavour, sometimes conscious, oftener unconscious, is to get behind Christ, and take up the development of man at the point where He touched it and turned it into His own channels. The tendency is not specifically Greek or Roman, but broadly heathen; it seeks less to realize the forms of a departed age than to recover the basis of its thought and life. Its characteristic is Naturalism, the expulsion from thought, not merely of the supernatural, but of the ideal, of the transcendental and spiritual, and the return to a nature sensuously interpreted. This Naturalism is so marked as to constitute the differentiating element of our intellectual movement. The thought of the Christian centuries, even where it has been least Christian, has still been penetrated by ideal and theistic elements. Theism has been, as it were, its common basis.

The Renaissance was a classical, but it was not a heathen, revival. The guiding genius was ideal, Plato and the poets, and these as, if not baptized into Christ, yet as prophetic and supplemental of Him. The return was not to heathenism, but to the idealism that had laboured to transcend it. In the Middle Ages, as in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, individual thinkers strove to rise from the current dualism to a higher and more rational unity; but these efforts were, as Spinoza's was, pantheistic, and made thought either the ultimate reality or an attribute coördinate with extension. In the last century the movement away from Christ was towards deism, a system which gave God singularly little to do, left Him Creator, but relieved Him from the labours and cares of Providence. Still, though more zealous for His being than His action,

Deism retained God for thought, and made duty to Him a necessary part of a reasonable and perfect life. But the intellectual movement of to-day is impatient of God, will have no nature that contains any trace of Him, only a nature charged with force sufficient to do all its own work. If it cannot escape the idea of cause, it will speak of it as matter or force, or even the unknown, not as reason, or will, or God. If it finds a purpose, marked by an extraordinary series of ascending creations, running through the history alike of the earth and man, it will speak of it in the terms of evolution, which, it sagely observes, has abolished at once the idea and the evidences of design, not perceiving that it has only substituted an immenser and more transcendent teleology. The quest of the modern intellect is for a nature without God; where it can do without Him it speaks in the language of constructive science; where it cannot, it uses the speech of agnosticism, and delivers unctuous homilies on the modesty and excellence of ignorance. And so the only nature it will have is the nature of the senses, and hence its naturalism is material and sensuous. It will have neither the idealism nor the deity of Plato, neither the reason nor the ideal end of Aristotle; but only the atoms of Democritus, the senses and the pleasures of Epicurus. The heathenism it revives is not spontaneous and primitive, like Homer's, where Nature is alive with the gods, and holds in her bosom, unsolved and unevolved, the problems and the germs of all the philosophies; but it is decadent and exhausted, the heathenism of Lucretius and the Sceptics, without any gods, without the imagination to which Nature was but the history and parable of Deity. Such a revival is a revival of spent forces, that can gather only for an early and more complete dispersion.

2. The parallel implied in these last sentences is not incidental; it is material and designed. The intellectual basis of modern is essentially akin to the intellectual basis of ancient thought before it was confronted and supplanted by the Christian religion. This affinity might be exhibited in detail, but time is too inexorable to allow more than a few illustrative points. Lucretius, for example, might be reckoned almost as much a thinker of the nineteenth century as of his own; his poem is as to form Latin, but, as to substance, it belongs to the school of modern English physical metaphysics. Like a true son of the school, he has unbounded contempt for all without it, unbounded admiration for all within it. The older superstitions have weighed down life and trodden upon man, but when the *Graius Homo*, the man of Greece, his master, Epicurus, rose, all was light; he passed the flaming walls of the world, traversed in thought the immeasurable universe, and returned a conqueror, to tell us what can and what cannot come into being. "Divine genius," a man of "God-like heart," may be the highest term he uses, but we have heard effusive scientists among us speak in almost identical terms of a late distinguished naturalist, or of the distinguished living explorer of the unknown and interpreter of the unknowable. Then his world is a world without design, atoms — the *rerum primordia** — are the unmade makers of all things; driven by mechanical necessity, they have been at work during infinite time past, have collided, cohered, combined, dissolved, tried every kind of combination, till, at length, they have laboured out the goodly nature we see, causing "the streams to replenish the greedy sea with copious river-waters; and the earth, fostered by the heat of the sun, to renew its produce, and the race of living

* i. 55.

things to come up and flourish, and the gliding fires of ether to live."* Earth has gotten the name of mother, since she produced all living creatures; many phenomena even now take form from rains and the heat of the sun. Beyond this modern scientific speculation can hardly be said to have passed. And religion, how did it come to be? By sleep and dreams and death, aided by thunder and earthquakes and other dread phenomena of nature, giving the idea of invisible beings, of mighty and many-limbed gods, unfriendly and terrible to man.† Were it not for the archaic Latin form, we might almost imagine we were here reading a condensed but elegant poetic version of the first part of Mr. Herbert Spencer's *Principles of Sociology*. Yet Lucretius would not banish faith or forbid worship; nay, if a man thinks right to call the sea Neptune, corn Ceres, and earth the mother of the gods, he is free to do it, "if he only forbear in earnest to stain his mind with foul religion."‡ And in his own splendid invocation to Alma Venus, *hominum divomque Voluptas*,§ he shows us how one who has denied the gods can yet use their speech and call for help upon "the sole mistress of all things, without whom nothing rises up into the divine borders of light, nothing grows to be glad or lovely." And have we not heard that the new religion is to be the worship of the universe; that the voice of science is the voice of the only God that now lives? Said Goethe, "He who has science and art has also religion,"|| and so say they all. And Mr. Herbert Spencer considerately resolves

* i, 1030–1034. † v, 1161 ff. ‡ i, 100.

§ i, 1–43. ii, 581 ff; cf. in particular, 658. After he has spoken about earth as *magna deum mater*, what he says as to certain *veteres Gracium docti*, 600 ff, has to be noted. The lines specially quoted are 653–9.

|| See especially Eckermann, "Gespräche mit Goethe." He says in Part I (1868) that religion stands in precisely the same relation to art as

all religious beliefs into "modes of the manifestation of the Unknowable," and so he exhorts each man to regard himself "as one of the myriad agencies through whom works the unknown cause,"* and his beliefs as beliefs it has produced that he may profess. What more or better could Lucretius himself have said when he implored the Venus, who for him personified the fructifying forces of earth, to "give to his lays an everlasting charm"?

3. It is impossible to pursue the parallel, though it could be made most complete, illustrative of all that is most modern in the way of conceiving religion, of handling religious history, of criticizing religious thought, and of representing and describing religious life. Yet enough has been said to enable us to emphasize one point — the thought most opposed to Christianity is ancient, and belongs to a decadent period, a period of philosophical feebleness, when the great thinkers of antiquity had ceased to reign because they had ceased to be understood. The strength of the modern movement is thus the strength of reaction, not of progress; to speak in the language of Evolution, it is an instance of a reversion to an earlier type, not the development of a new and higher.

There is nothing older than the newer objections to

any other supreme material for living. Yet he confesses that, as he draws near death, he thinks of the spirit as indestructible, and active from everlasting to everlasting. He compares the Mohammedan religion with the Christian, to the advantage of the latter, especially as regards its doctrine of Providence, which he finds expressed in "the hairs of your head are numbered," and "a sparrow does not fall to the ground without the will of your Father." He saw some good in the doctrine of grace; and the Pentateuch he loved as the work of Moses. He thought that the Christian was the only perfect morality; and that the longer man lived the more Christian was he destined to become, especially as the religion was less a thing of worship and more of feeling and action. These things are said to relieve Goethe from the blame the position of the text would assume.

* *First Principles*, p. 123.

Christianity; they are as ancient as the earliest literary criticism of the religion. M. Renan is a sort of Celsus *redivivus*, while Mr. Matthew Arnold is a kind of modernized Lucian, though with better manners, more religion, and a higher mind. Celsus may be said to be an ancient yet a modern who has his living representatives. Men say two things: (*α*) Miracles are impossible, "as the order of nature is an order which cannot be broken." And Christianity, therefore, as essentially miraculous, is necessarily false. (*β*) For it implies that "God has so badly arranged matters that He needs to interfere with His own order on behalf of man," which is an idea quite unworthy of an Infinite Intelligence.

Now let us hear Celsus: (*α*) As to the belief in the miraculous, he satirizes the Christian for saying: "Jesus is the Son of God because He healed the lame and the blind," and He also "raised the dead." (*β*) He holds that "the world is not made for man any more than for the dolphin or the eagle: it is made solely to be a work of God, complete in itself, and in all its parts; all things within it have reference to each other only so far as they bear upon the whole. God cares for it . . . and He is angry at men as little as He is angry at apes and flies." (*γ*) He says: "Christians are like a lot of frogs or worms holding a council in the mud, and debating the question, which of them is the greatest sinner, yet only that they may the more proudly say, God is, and we are next-of-kin to Him, like to Him in all things; all things are for our sakes; though we have sinned, God has sent His Son to save us and burn up the wicked." What better, save in politeness — for no writer has now the excuse which Celsus had, that Jesus was an upstart and Christianity a thing of yesterday — is the modern satire of the Christian idea? M. Renan's natural history of the belief in the resurrection is well known;

a possessed woman, once the home of seven devils, unable to yield her Lord to death, fancies she sees Him, then believes it, and proclaims her belief till all receive it.* The theory is in Celsus; a fanatical woman, and a band of credulous men explain the whole matter.† In other points the affinity is rather with Matthew Arnold.‡ Celsus has a defence of national religions against the aggressive universalism of Christianity, and so remarkable is it that a too hasty translation might almost make it look like an unrevised version of Mr. Arnold's apology for the Anglican establishment. We are too prosaic to dare an excursion into those realms of imagination, wit, satire, and sweet reasonableness where our modern critic has his agreeable home. Mr. Arnold is a man of inimitable gravity; but it is possible to take the gravest man too gravely. It has been the sin of the Philistines to be too serious to be understood of him, and they have had to expiate their sin by understanding him too seriously. And so it may be the part of wisdom simply to say, "The stream of tendency that makes for righteousness" is as old as Buddha; and the reduction of religion to conduct, or "morality touched by emotion," is as ancient as Stoicism.

4. But within all this similarity there are significant differences. The modern is more reverent than the ancient thinker; his spirit is sadder, humaner, more possessed of the enthusiasm of humanity, with a deeper sense alike of

* *Les Apôtres*, pp. 6–18. (Ed. 1866.)

† The reference is to the *Contra Celsum*, lib. ii, cc. 57 ff. All other quotations have been verified, and may here be specified: (α) is from ii, cc. 48 ff; (β) from iv, 99; (γ) from iv, 23. The latter is somewhat adapted.

‡ There is no point where the rebuke of Celsus by Origen is more perfect or better deserved, or the agreement of Celsus with Mr. Arnold is more complete, than in the doctrine of conversion, which Celsus saw to be incompatible with his idea of a national religion; lib. iii, cc. 65 ff.

the necessity of religion and its capabilities for good. These are the Christian elements in the modern intellect; of them it has not been able, if it had been able it would not have been willing, to make a complete renunciation. Christianity has so made the mind of man new that it can never again become exactly the old mind. Just look at the most characteristic of the moderns: every man of them is struggling towards a religion, is endeavouring to create one, to place his personal faith, new reasoned and intellectual, over against the historical faith, which has the glory, but also the burden of the centuries. Not every one has had the courage with Comte to institute a hierarchy and order of worship, to make a calendar of the saints of humanity, to use the living mother, wife, and daughter to dispossess the ancient Virgin, and to substitute *le grand Être*, collective man, for God; but not any one has had the courage to abandon all religion, or dismiss it in the hot words of Lucretius. The last words of Strauss were those in which he sketched the religion that was to be, the worship of the universe, the order that, while physical and necessary, was still benevolent and moral. M. Renan passed those miserable months when gay and brilliant Paris lay within the iron circle of the German armies in speculating as to how best humanity was to create Deity, or, as he phrased it, "organize God." That was to be the sum of its achievements, the symbol that its course was complete; Evolution will have done its perfect work when mankind has developed Deity. The philosopher of pessimism has found out that, though it is impossible to worship the cause of so miserable a world, it is necessary to worship something — the religion of the spirit is needful to alleviate the miseries of the flesh. But it is needless to complete the catalogue; all witness to the same thing; man cannot

live without religion, he must have one, whatever its kind. And two qualities, reverence and humanity, it must have; must, on the one hand, at once quicken and satisfy man's yearning after the perfect and the permanent; and, on the other, gladden his life, soften his sorrows, govern his affections, purify his sympathies, direct and regulate his energies in behalf of all mankind. The modern mind feels a reverence the ancient never knew; the new religions burn with a humanity the old never possessed. And these things are the work of Christ; He has made the thought of God so majestic, yet so benign, that man never feels but awed in its presence; and the love of man so needful to a perfect manhood and to the perfecting of mankind, that no sane soul can forget its being or ignore its claims.

VIII

1. Now this analysis of the characteristics and elements of the modern intellectual movement, so far at least as its set is away from or against Christianity, has shown us how it ought to be dealt with. It ought not to be despised or ignored, or, worst of all, reviled on the one hand, or conciliated and softly spoken to on the other, but it must be frankly and honestly met face to face. What we have before us is the conflict of two antithetical conceptions of the universe; two radically opposed views as to nature and man, their constitution, course, destiny. It is here where the issue must be joined, the battle fought out. Compromise is impossible, a mechanical view of the universe leaves us no freedom, and so no God; a spiritual or theistic view of the universe leaves order, because it affirms reason, but it denies necessity. If the movement be intel-

lectual, the intellect alone can meet and master it. It will not do to leave it, on the one hand, to the blended anathemas and lamentations of pietism, or, on the other, to the effusions of cosmopolitan religious sentiment. The men who believe that the highest truths of religion are the highest truths of reason must speak as they believe. There is no worse foe to his faith than the man who hates rational thought as if it were the invention of Satan, rather than the gift of God; there is no man who so little understands faith as the man who thinks devout feeling or an inspired heart, the whole of religion. Emotion is particular, thought is universal; what belongs to emotion has no worth but for the individual; what exists for thought has value for all. Fine sentiments do not make strong men; massive truths are needed to move rational minds. Where truth is concerned, thought must be exercised in order that true feeling may be created and right conduct result. He who does not seek to know the truth can never truly either live or love. In a recent work on "Natural Religion" we have what we may call an attempt at an Eirenicon.* The ground of peace is to be the dictum that religion is admiration; and we all admire: the man of science, the order and immensity of the universe; the man of culture, the perfection of manhood and the creations of art; and the man of faith, God and the ways of God. But the only point of agreement is in the word admiration; in the thing there is radical difference. We admire the admirable, and the admirable we do not feel, we conceive. The absolutely admirable is the absolutely perfect; what is less than this we do not wholly admire. Physical harmonies are not moral, may

* The reference here is to a once famous book by the late Professor Sir John Seeley. It was in point of time after *Ecce Homo*, but in the order of thought before it.

awaken sensuous wonder, or awe, not the finely touched moral admiration which cannot choose but worship. The harmonies of a perfect culture or perfect art may impart the highest intellectual or imaginative pleasure, but cannot kindle the admiration evoked by the absolute ethical beauty of the Altogether Good. This latter stands alone, for it alone is worship, born, as it were, of the vision of God. And he who would obscure this vision and make it a matter of no moment, or a thing that may be without God, knows too little of the nature of religion to be a maker of peace.

2. Our position, then, is fundamental: we must build on the conception of God, find in it the material for the bulwark that needs to be raised to meet and break the modern intellectual movement towards ancient heathenism. The Christian idea of God is full of unexhausted possibilities; it is rich in wealth unworked by thought, in unevoked energies for religion and conduct. It is simply the sublimest idea that has ever dawned upon the mind of man; — holds in it a multitude of elements any one of which is grander than all the sublimities of science. Do men stand in awe before the immensities of space and time, oppressed by the vision of the countless suns and systems that sleep in the bosom of the infinite, shine to each other as stars, and move in their vast orbits as to stateliest music? Yet what is that to the thought of an Intelligence that knows no here or there, only an everywhere; no yesterday or to-morrow, only an Eternal Now? What is it to an Intelligence whose reason is order, who had but to think to create all worlds, to whose thought these worlds are but the words and syllables of a visible speech? Geology has opened up a marvellous vista into the past; imagination grows giddy as, standing with its feet on the solid earth,

it looks back into the eternity behind it, and sees the slow-passing ages that are the successive moments in the history of its own becoming. But that is a brief and empty vision compared with the thought of a God whose home is eternity, who ever was a Maker, whose purpose runs through all ages, and whose will works in all worlds, whose reason made and maintains the order of the whole, yet whose heart waits on all persons and creates all good.

And if we turn from science in the universe, and look at science in relation to man, his problems, his sorrows, his miseries, his mysteries, our religious conception is touched with a sublimity still more incomparable. Science has achieved much through and for man; yet it must not be forgotten that man has made the sciences, not the sciences man. The better he has become, the more they have grown; and so it has been through what religion has made him that he has been able to make the sciences. They have in many ways blessed their maker, have enriched his life, filled it with innumerable interests, given him command over nature, its resources and forces, have caused him to become a wonder to himself, made his progress and discoveries his greatest astonishment. But in one aspect the sciences have accomplished singularly little; they have not found out how to make man a perfect or even a better moral being; they may have lessened the suffering, but it is doubtful whether they have increased the happiness of the world; it is certain they have not found any way by which a guilty man may be made good, or a will in rebellion against order brought into harmony with it. On the contrary, modern science has made a nobler morality and remedial moral action a harder, I do not say, a rarer thing. Its most distinctive doctrine is, when applied to our gravest moral and social problems,

a ruthless doctrine. Progress is worked through the struggle for existence and by survival of the fittest. That means the non-fittest either do not, or should not, survive; if they ought not to live, it is on the ground that it is better for the whole that they perish. But now note the pitiless way in which this doctrine acts, how it paralyzes beneficence and all the gracious and remedial humanities. It estimates a man solely by his worth to the community, and is proud of him only as he has the strength that can be victorious in the struggle. He has no personal value in its eyes. Wasted manhood is manhood to be abolished, not reclaimed. Moral evil is a species of disease to be cured by being killed; disease is a sort of social crime to be punished by death. Disease and crime are thus alike guilty, sins against the common good, and the sinner is to be neither spared nor saved, but simply and speedily destroyed. Society so conceived is void of moral qualities; it is a realm where strength is king, where order is but the action of victorious force, where the feeble and the bad are alike offenders against law and dangerous to life. In it the gentle spirits have no place, nor the tender souls that cling to the strong, soften them into helpfulness and sweeten them by their fragrance. A doctrine that knows no pity can work no cure; in a society where destruction of the guilty and the weak is the only remedy there may be victorious forces, but there cannot be happy men.

3. Now, let us look at our ultimate Christian conception in the same relations, see how it affects our idea of man, alike as individual and as race, both in harmony and out of harmony with the higher laws of life and being. God is reason, and reason is order; His rational thought is the basis of all our harmonies, whether physical or moral.

But reason is not blind, its very means are ends; it loves the instruments it makes to use. The men God thought into being God loves; they exist for His purposes, and His purposes must be good. A spirit is not like a mass of organized atoms in process of ceaseless change, losing one form only to assume another, in all its changes never increasing and never decreasing the sum total of the forces of the universe; it is simply a permanent being, progressive because permanent, endowed with almost infinite capabilities. Spirits rose to be society to God; His beatitude blossomed, as it were, into creation, and men became that the subjective happiness of the Infinite might become objective. But spirits are by their very nature objects of discipline; they are here to learn obedience, to become by it sons of God. That is the end; towards it all the moral agencies of the universe work. A man is in God's sight an actual or potential son, known and handled as such; there, because God loved, able to sin, to be miserable, but not able to compel the God who loved to hate him, or refrain from working the utmost good his badness will allow.

But if we so conceive the relation of the Creator to man, think how we must conceive human life. Every man is of value to God, has a place in His purpose and a part in His love, and so the man's loss is, as it were, a loss to God. It is not enough, then, that the fittest survive, and the non-fit die; it is necessary that the utmost and best possible be made out of every man, that the strong do not simply forbear to crush the weak, but use their strength to protect him, that he too may become strong and sound. The man who has most affinity with God will be the most beneficent of men; he will hate guilt, but be pitiful to the guilty, doing his best not simply to punish crime, but to convert the criminal, that by conversion of the persons

he may make an end to the thing. On the mechanical theory the hope of the world lies in the penalty that deals quickest and most utter death; on the Christian, in the regeneration that changes the man and uplifts the life. The state of struggle which science glorifies is a state of war, or, at best, of the armed truce which breeds coarse and selfish passions in those who see in the weak and bad only elements of disturbance; but a state of moral law which religion postulates, is a state of discipline and progress, where the good of the whole is worked only through the service and good of all the parts. Kepler thought that to discover the laws of the universe was to think the thoughts of God after Him; the Christian believes that by devotion to his kind, lessening its evil and misery, multiplying its virtue and happiness, he is fulfilling the purpose of God. Through the good man the plan of God is realized; he is a factor in its fulfilment. To him while men do evil, or suffer, or are ignorant, something is which God hates, which he as God's liegeman must contend against and destroy.

Where this idea reigns it commands the mightiest moral enthusiasms and energies into the cause of progress, bids them work for the amelioration and happiness of the race. The man possessed of God is an enthusiast for humanity; his passion is to see realized in time the ideals of the Eternal. And so we must maintain our fundamental Christian conception, but make it in its fullest integrity the basis of our intellectual and therefore of our moral life. The spirit of man has grown sadder, I had almost said more savage to himself and less merciful to his fellows under the sway of the more speculative sciences. Life is losing its enthusiasms, men are growing weary of it, feeling it a more insoluble problem, a more

intolerable burden. Pessimism is the coming philosophy; the Unknown of Spencer is being translated into the Unconscious of Von Hartmann, and a world which is only a struggle for existence is being openly described as so miserable as to be much worse than none. The result is inevitable; empty life of its transcendental and divine ideals, and it ceases to be worth living. Once it so ceases, men will not be at the trouble to live it, or to mend it. The belief in God is the inspiration of man; the moment it dies progress will cease, reaction will begin, and the race of men stand within measurable distance of their end.

IX

But we come now to another and even graver series of problems — those concerned with the relation of religion to the estranged of the industrial classes.

1. For these classes belong to what may be called the region of practical politics. I may at once and frankly state that I do not regard the causes of estrangement here as in any appreciable degree intellectual, due to so-called difficulties of belief. They are mainly practical and political, due to the inefficiency of the churches, their failure to make religion the personal and social force it ought to be. I know that there is much active and aggressive disbelief among working-men, but I also know that it draws much of its vigour from the social, political, and economical doctrines with which it has been skilfully allied. It is the positive, not the negative doctrines that attract and command the industrial classes. It is also true that the objections to religion that prevail among them can be better met by instruction than by

argument; for these objections are for the most part based on partial or erroneous ideas as to what religion is, and what is necessary to it; on the narrowest and least enlightened views as to the Bible and its history, and the relation of its history to the truths it reveals. Hence the main matter here is not apology; it is exposition; the opportunity created is not for a reasoned defence, but an exhibition of the religion in its truth and in its power.

But this seems to me the very hardest thing to attain; yet the most necessary of attainment. Our history and our methods are here alike against us, so much has to be unlearned and undone, so much to be learned and accomplished. The conflict with revived heathenism hardly troubles me — the nature of man is a sufficient guarantee that the victory will be to the ideal and divine. But here it is not nature, it is the churches that are concerned. They must work in the spirit of the Master, and for His ends, do what they have never yet done — full justice to the religion of Christ. There is one thing I profoundly feel — the way in which the churches, taken as a whole, have allowed the industrial classes to grapple, almost unaided, with their problems, to fight, unhelped, their way into their liberties and rights. I will not speak of the Established Church, of the way in which it has pauperized the labourer and divided the aristocracy, whose education it has controlled for centuries, from the people of England; and, as a consequence, from the conditions that make the simplest justice natural and possible. Of these things I will not speak, for I feel too deeply our common sin, and am too anxious to reach the question, What is the remedy for those ages of neglect and wrong-doing? The simplest is here the completest answer; the churches must set about realizing

the religion of Christ, making it a veritable law for life, translating its principles into living forces not for the maintenance of what is, but for the creation of what ought to be.

2. I wish, indeed, not to be misunderstood. To me the primary work of the religion is to save men; of the churches, to preach the Gospel. This is fundamental, work that must be done before anything else is possible; that left undone disqualifies for everything else. It is through the saving of persons that the world is to be saved. But what concerns us is not this primary duty, but the conditions necessary to its fulfilment; how the churches are to become better able, as regards the great body of the people, successfully to carry it out. It is not enough to organize evangelistic missions, however excellent and fit these may be. It is not the distinction of the industrial classes to be in peculiar need of conversion; it is the need of the so-called upper classes in a still more eminent degree. What is necessary to reach and affect both is a more fully realized Christianity, the resolute endeavour to bring the religion professed of the churches into completer harmony with the mind of Christ. The toiling classes do not feel what it can do for them, or see what it has done. The Gospel is full of a large economical spirit, and it was never so needed to be heard as at this hour. There is the land question, whether it be good to allow the aggregation of land into a few hands, to permit the rights of property to override the duties of humanity; and whether it be within a man's moral power to depopulate the district he owns, or sacrifice the people who lived in it and by it to his own pecuniary and ambitious schemes. On a question like that the religion that loves man and lives by his love has the foremost right to be heard.

Then, too, this religion ought to have something to

say on the question of Capital and Labour. To it the millions that toil are not "hands," but are men, the neighbours and brothers of the rich, to be dealt with as their own flesh and blood. The question is not settled when labour gets a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, or, what is as necessary, gives a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. That is but the mechanical and mercantile side of it — the engine well stoked that its full power may be put forth; beneath it lies the religious side. Men do not cease to owe each other the primary and cardinal religious duties when they become employers and employed; they rather owe these in an increased degree. Here men are brothers, bound to love one another; and love has its duties and its services as well as labour and capital. These duties and services do not, like the condescension of the great or the charity of the rich, destroy self-reliance and lessen self-respect; but they are able to create and enlarge both. There is no inspiration in mere mercenary toil; the wage paid only in money degrades both him that gives and him that takes. To work well a man must love his work, and he can never love his work if he hates or despises the persons for whom or through whom it is done. The employer of labour who is no lover of man will never ennoble the labour he employs. Were the Christian idea of brotherhood made a living and governing idea, our gravest industrial problems either were solved or would never have been propounded. Labour would then have all its rights, and neglect none of its duties; capital would then, in doing all its duties, obtain all its rights. "Common interests" would then be no mere phrase, but a beneficent reality, for where all were inspired by one spirit, all would be partakers of one body, and members one of another. Were the kingdom of God realized, every man would be in his own order a

worker, and every worker would receive his due and sufficient reward.

3. These must stand as types of what is meant rather than as discussions of a large and grave theme. Religion ought to feel that social and industrial questions are peculiarly its own, and cannot be wisely or justly determined without its help. And to feel an obligation ought here to be to fulfil it; loss of opportunity is loss of actual and inherent power. Religion would be all the stronger for being more real, — an operative and efficient factor in the spheres where men most strenuously live. Secularism should have had no excuse for its being; religion ought to be secular, and would be all the more spiritual and eternal for so being. What does not make the most of man for time and of time for man will not make the best of his eternity. Eternity is now; the man who is, is man the immortal, and the aim of religion ought to be to realize the ideal of God in every man and in all his relations. For it is certain that the more the mind of Christ obtains outside the churches the greater will be its purchase over the thoughts of men within them. If we do nothing toward the incarnation of His mind in society and the State, we shall find that the forces now coming to the front will not be faithful or respectful to religion, or even tolerant of it. Democracy is everywhere in the ascendant; the age of despotisms, of one-man sovereignties, is passing, has almost passed. The people are now the State, their will is the regnant will, and that will has this characteristic — it loves principles, it hates compromises; and the principles it loves must be regulative, fit to be applied to the work and guidance of life. And if religion is to control life, religion must become what Christ meant it to be, a real and applied law, opening its unworked

mines of social, industrial, and political wisdom and truth.

Oh, I often wish for one hour of the Master! What a revolution His mere appearance would work in the churches that call themselves by His Name! Would He not speak somewhat thus? "I came not to create immense vested interests, wealthy corporations that fear loss too much either to gain men or to do justly between the poor for whom they are and the rich through whom they are; nor to form organized societies too anxious to justify their past sins to mind their present duties. I came to create a kingdom of the truth; where the truth was to reign and regulate all the relations of life, the conduct of all men and classes. My Gospel was to save sinners, to create peace between men and God, but also between man and man. All men were to be brothers; each was to be loved of all, and the common law the law of love. My truth is denied because My law is neglected; do not expect men to believe while you disobey. Let the reign of God be realized in your societies, and His Word will soon be victorious on the earth."

X

We have here simply to state a few duties and ideals of the churches which bear upon the determining principles.

1. The distinction between the Christian religion and the churches is here cardinal. The religion creates the churches; the churches exist for the religion, interpret it to the people among whom they live. This it is which constitutes their immense responsibility; men think of Christianity as the church they best know conceives and

represents it. Monsieur Renan, for example, in a recent book tells the story of his education and loss of faith. He makes us feel how the Spirit of Christ fascinated and held him with a spell he could hardly break. He says, in view of the supercilious scepticism which denies without being at the trouble either to inquire or think — "In fact, few persons have the right to disbelieve in Christianity." But now, what gave him the right to disbelieve, what was the basis of his own denial? Let us hear: "One single dogma abandoned, one single teaching of the church rejected, is negation of the church and revelation." And what does this mean? That he construed the religion in the sense and terms of the papal church, thought that they stood or fell together with it, and so believed himself driven, when he denied the claims of Rome, to deny the truth of Christianity. Yet the same church illustrates in a favourable sense a point already emphasized. There is no people so loyal to a church as the Irish are to the church of Rome. And why? Because that church has so identified herself with the wrongs and aspirations of the people that the people feel that in being true to it they are true not simply to their best friend, but to the best and noblest elements in themselves and in their history. Let these examples show the tremendous responsibilities of the churches; as they represent Christ, the people will believe Christ to be; if they make religion live to the people, the people will live for it, even though it be in its most imperfect form.

2. The right of a church to be is twofold; and consists (i) in its power to interpret the religion, and (ii) in its ability to make it a living and efficient factor of life and conduct to the people among whom as a church it dwells. These two, indeed, are one; the church that best interprets the religion will secure for it the most victorious life. It is not

necessary to insist on this point, for a religious society is not vindicated by its history, but by the degree in which it conforms to the essential ideal of the religion, and is capable of working for its complete embodiment. This constitutes the sole and indefeasible right of a church to be; the sole, for that right is valid, and no other, which is based on the possession of the truth; the indefeasible, for that right, and no other, is owned and crowned of God which does His work among men.

3. A church to be loyal to the idea and truths it bears must be free. Its ideals are never realized, are only in process of realization, and the church that would best promote their realization must have no interests but the interest they create. Its enthusiasm ought to be for the ideal, a conflict against the evils and imperfections that are in the present, and a struggle towards a better and more perfect future. But in order to this two things are necessary; first, the emphasis must lie on the truths and ideals it carries, and next, it must be free to work by their inspiration and in their methods for their complete authority and embodiment. An Established Church is not free enough to obey its own truth; it too much depends on man's law to make him feel the authority of God's. Established churches are always strongest in periods of decadent belief; but weakest in times of commanding and progressive enthusiasm. Two things at this moment operate in their favour — the conservative* instincts of an old and historical

* I speak here as the son of a people best represented by Andrew Melville in his famous interview at Falkland Palace with King James, as described in the diary of his nephew, James: "To the which, I beginning to reply, in my manner, Mr. Andrew could not abide it, but broke off upon the King in so zealous, powerful, and irresistible a manner that howbeit the King used his authority in a most crabbed and colerick manner, yet Mr. Andrew bore him down, and uttered the commission as from the almighty God, calling the King but 'God's silly vassal'; and,

people, proud of their ancient institutions, and the current Agnosticism, which makes many too uncertain or too indifferent in religion to bear the moral strain or tension of the Free churches.

The characteristics most distinctive of an Established Church are almost necessarily political and social, but of a Free Church theological and ethical. The former may be theological and ethical, but in a much less essential and constitutive sense than the latter. A Free Church may act in the field of politics, but its political is not its primary, only its secondary or derivative character. An Established Church as established is a church politically created and legally guaranteed; but a Free Church is a voluntary society created by affinities of thought and life. This radical difference penetrates and determines in the subtlest way their respective characters. In the one the expediences and

taking him by the sleeve, says in effect, through much hot reasoning and many interruptions: 'Sir, we will humbly reverence your Majesty always, namely in public, but when we have occasion to be with your Majesty in private, and the truth is, you are brought in extreme danger both of your life and crown, and with you the country and Kirk of Christ is like to wrack, for not telling you the truth, and giving you a faithful counsel, we must discharge our duty therein, or else be traitors both to Christ and you! And, therefore, Sir, as divers times before, so now again, I must tell you, there are two Kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is Christ Jesus the King, and his kingdom the Kirk, whose subject King James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member! And they whom Christ has called and commanded to watch his Kirk, and given his spiritual kingdom, has sufficient power of him, and authority so to do, both together and severally; the which no Christian King nor Prince should control and discharge, but fortify and assist, otherwise not faithful subjects nor members of Christ. And, Sir, when you were in your swadling-clothes, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land in spite of all his enemies, and his officers and ministers conversed and assembled for the ruling and weal of his Kirk, which was ever for your well-fare, defence, and preservation also, when their same enemies was seeking your destruction and cutting off."—Autobiography and diary of Mr. James Melville (Wodrow Society Publications, 1852), pp. 370–1.

compromises of statecraft find a congenial home; in the other it is more natural to give authority to principles, to receive inspiration from ideals. An Established Church thinks of the maintenance of the constitution rather than the good of the people; a Free Church thinks of the good of the people rather than the maintenance of the constitution, and regards the constitution as good only so far as it promotes the people's well-being. The one conceives religion as in need of a nurse, the church as favoured by being made a suckling of kings; the other conceives religion as the nurse and master of sovereign and subjects alike, a kingdom of heaven where every king on earth is a vassal, and never can be any more. An Established Church is more of a static, but a Free Church more of a dynamic force in society; the one seeks its authority in the past, the other its ideals and inspirations in the future; the first is satisfied with what is, but the other strives towards what ought to be the ideally perfect State, where all men may exercise the power to use the rights they have won as citizens, to realize as persons the image of God, and as peoples His kingdom of heaven on earth.

4. But this involves a further point: Free churches can best do their work by being faithful to the truths they carry, the Word and Gospel of God. They are not to make the truth easy for man, but an authority over him — a veritable divine law. Much of the success and strength of Catholicism lies in the way it handles the weaknesses of men, in the skill with which it can compel them to serve its own ends. But it ought to be our part to speak to the noblest in man, to persuade the reason, to command the conscience. The higher the motives, the better the man; for debased motives mean a depraved nature and an impure religion. Be it ours, then, to speak the truths God has

given, as given of God; sacrificing no truth manifestly His, abating no claim known or felt to be divine. Free churches have no prescriptive rights; they must be true to truth and duty to live. They must be theological, speak positive, constructive truths as to God; and they must be ethical, enforce every real and religious duty men can owe to God and man. Men must believe to live, and live as they believe. Theological Agnosticism is religious death, leaves us without any absolute ethical system, any means by which the reign of God can be realized through the reason and in the conscience of men.

As teachers and preachers of eternal truths, what magnificent institutions our Free churches are, gifted with what splendid opportunities for instruction! Millions, we may say, meet every Sunday to worship God, to hear expounded truths they believe to be His, to confess sin, to utter thanksgiving, to plume the wings of hope and enlarge the spirit of love, so to let glorious eternity stream into dull time as to make it seem the luminous garment of God. Analyze a single congregation: The employer, wealthy, educated, refined; the employed, hard-handed, hard-headed, begrimed in body and mind with the dust of toil; the teacher, burdened with thoughts communicable, incommunicable; the scholar, groping his way with many a stumble into knowledge; the mistress from the drawing-room; the maid from the kitchen; the well-to-do man of business, unfamiliar with hardship; and the needy tradesman, struggling hard to hold aloft his honour and keep the wolf from his door — these and hundreds more like them meet to declare by common acts and words that they are children of one Father and heirs of one home. And, think, the words they hear ought to be not only winged, but needed words, able to humble

or exalt, to warn or encourage, to break into penitence or soothe into peace, to brace against temptation or cheer in sorrow. In the same pew the new-made bride and the new-made widow may sit; the one with a gladness, the other with a grief that lies too deep for tears. Side by side may worship a soul ripe, chastened, mellowed by the sunshine of the divine face, and a soul dumb with despair, lost in a night of fear, feeling that he would be only happy if he could fall

> "Upon the great world's altar stairs,
> That slope through darkness up to God."

Now, could anything equal in actual or potential power for good institutions that count supreme opportunities like these by the thousand? Churches ought to be the most splendid moral forces of the world, for theirs are the most splendid moral moments in the life of man.

5. In conclusion, may I speak a word to you, my brothers in the ministry of Jesus Christ? But what shall it be? I feel — as who does not? — a feeble man in this work, able only to see what a man ought to be; not able, in any tolerable sense, to become it. Brothers, you may ask, "Why ought we to differ from other Christian men? What is proper in them is not improper in us; we but assert our common rights if we claim to live as they." True, brothers, if you put it so, and so put I will not argue the matter with you. But let me put it thus — Ought we not to differ from other men, labour to live more purely, more nobly, with more simplicity of mind, more singleness of purpose? We have chosen our vocation, and we chose it thinking it the highest possible to man, thinking, too, that our vocation was of God. And shall we not live, and think, and endeavour as if we were the called of God rather

than as if we were the "Hail Fellows" of the market and the street. We have, indeed, joined a noble company, and our ancestry is the most illustrious and honourable of the earth. It runs back into a most ancient past, and begins with those Hebrew prophets who have been dead nigh three thousand years, yet they still live as speakers for God. Our nearer ancestry is still more glorious. The first Christian preacher was Jesus Himself, the greatest of discourses His Sermon on the Mount. Peter was a preacher, impetuous, impassioned, with a speech that was like "a mighty rushing wind." Paul was a preacher, great in thought, in labours, in the noble obscurity that his spirit changed into deathless fame. The muster roll of Christian preachers is but the record of the grandest Christian names. John, the apostle of love, whose spirit is for ever incarnated in our fourth gospel; Athanasius, the maker for centuries of the Christian conception of God; Augustine, the mind that has for ages ruled and still rules the thought of the Western church; Bernard, great as a monk, great as a mystic, but greater as a preacher of the truths that moved and reformed the Middle Ages; Martin Luther, son of a miner, author of the Reformation, strong speaker of the strong words that created Protestantism; Calvin, son of a French lawyer, creator of a modern theocracy, the scholar, thinker, and statesman that made the thought and policy that braved and beat back the counter-reformation; Latimer and Hooker, Baxter and Bunyan, Howe and Cudworth, Berkeley and Wesley — these are but typical names selected from our long ancestral roll, men who have made the preaching of the Cross as the very wisdom and the power of God. And the vocation these men adorned will honour any man or any man's son; the arduous matter is for the man or man's son to honour the vocation. The power to

do so comes of God alone, and comes only to the man who is loyal to His "everlasting gospel," the Truth which, Milton said, is strong, "next to the Almighty," and remains after every conflict, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners."

III

THE SACERDOTAL AND THE PURITAN IDEA*

IN England to-day two opposed conceptions of the Christian church stand face to face. The opposition is radical — relates to the collective idea and to all its parts, to the nature of the church, its polity, functions, offices, orders, sacraments, ritual, doctrine. In the last analysis these opposite theories of the church mean doctrines of religion so opposed that the men who hold them hardly ever become intelligible to each other; they speak of the things of God in the same mother tongue, but so think of them as to be aliens in heart and strangers in mind. According to the one conception the church is an organized society, with a political constitution it owes to its Founder and His apostles — visible, historical, a veritable corporate divine state, so instituted and guided of God as to be possessed of divine authority and invested with divine rights. According to the other conception the church is the kingdom of God, or of the truth, created and governed directly by Christ, composed of His saints, with vassals, but without princes, civil or ecclesiastical, by its nature invisible, omnipresent, ideal, incapable of realization in any or in all forms of polity, existing in part in all the churches, fully embodied in no one singly or even in all combined. On

* Paper read before the Congregational Union at Hanley in the autumn of 1885.

the one theory certain offices and orders are held to be so necessary to the very being of the church, that where they are not it cannot be, and where they are they represent a regulated and continuous succession which has, through all the centuries, been the chosen channel for the transmission of Apostolic grace; but on the other theory there are no official sanctities, no inalienable orders, no persons that must be, in order that Christ may be, in His Church. All depends on the indwelling Spirit, and the truth He reveals, in order that it may be preached by pure and spiritual men. Each conception of what the church is has its correspondent doctrine of the sacraments; according to the one, they are miracles and mysteries, efficacious, where properly administered, for the creation and maintenance of the divine life; according to the other, they are symbols, charged, however administered, with spiritual significance and quickening to the man, and to him only, who receives them in humility and faith. The theory that emphasizes the religious office, order, person, act, is Sacerdotal; the theory that accentuates the religious truth, spirit, character, conduct, is Puritan. Sacerdotalism makes the worship and honour of God depend on its own institutions and modes, and on the ministers it creates and controls. Puritanism believes that spirit and truth are the only things essential to worship, and godliness the mode in which God most loves to be honoured.

I

We who are sons are also heirs of the historical Puritanism of England; and our position creates our responsibilities and defines and enforces our duties. What these are a brief historical retrospect may help us the better to understand.

1. The Congregational system or ideal is not a mere theory of Church politics or government, but, fundamentally, a doctrine of religion, a way of apprehending and realizing the Christian faith. Its ecclesiastical polity is but its doctrine applied to the exercise and cultivation of the religious life. Catholicism is a splendid system, even without the religious idea that fills it; but Independency, apart from its religious basis and ideal, is at once mean and impotent, impracticable and visionary. Our fathers held that legislation, civil or ecclesiastical, could not create a church; conversion and converted men alone could. All saints were kings and priests unto God, and could exercise their functions only as they stood in open and immediate relation with Him. In His Church Christ did not reign while officials governed; He both governed and reigned. Over against the Puritan stood the Anglican system, which, becoming in the hands of Laud at once sacerdotal and imperial, made the king absolute in the State that the priesthood might be supreme in the church. That policy forced our fathers to feel that freedom, to reign in either the spiritual or civil realm, must reign in both; that there could be no Free church while the State was enslaved, no enslaved State where the church was free. Political liberty and spiritual religion were not two, but one; neither was possible without the other; and so for both Hampden died, and Milton pleaded, and Cromwell fought; while their resistance to both had the remarkable effect of making of Laud a martyr and of Charles a saint.

(i) Independency for a brief and troubled season ruled the destinies of England, but the season, though brief, was not inglorious; just long enough to allow its possibilities and potencies to appear, not to allow its ideal of order and freedom and faith to be incorporated. The

Restoration, which ended its opportunity, was the triumph, not of religious conviction, but of political reaction; it might be a Church, but it was not a religion which was victorious. When we compare the men, the minds, the morals, the issues, national and ecclesiastical, of the two periods, we have no cause to be ashamed of our defeat. If to be too severe in conduct, too pure in morals, and too high and ideal in aims, is to err, it is a noble error; but noble is the last term any one would apply to the licence, the lust, the mockery, the superstitious unbelief that graced the graceless court of the restored Monarch. Cromwell may have been, as they said, low-born — "a bankrupt, beggarly fellow," who dared to enter "the Parliament House with a threadbare, torn cloak, and a greasy hat," which were "perhaps not paid for"* — but he was so

* The quotation is from South's famous sermon on "All Contingencies under the Direction of God's Providence." It appears as VIII in his *Collected Sermons*, and has for its text Proverbs xvi. 33. It had not been heard by Charles II, for it was not preached in Westminster Abbey till two weeks after his death. The Lord Rochester, to whom he is reported to have said: "Od's—for God's—fish. Lory your chaplain must be made a bishop. Put me in mind of him at the next death," —was Lawrence Hyde, Clarendon's second son; and not Henry Wilmot, the more famously infamous Earl of Rochester, who remained to the very end a favourite of Charles, in spite of Burnet, who was not too good-natured, saying: "the King loved his company better than his person." But Lawrence Hyde was never a favourite of Charles II, whatever he may have been of his brother James. What is written in the text has a history, which it ought to be judged by. So far as I can remember, while attending some Union Meetings I had been the guest of the local vicar. He and I had a friendly controversy over the advantages and disadvantages of free and written prayers. I told him of what had happened lately to me; how I had gone to a bookshelf and taken down the collected edition of South's Sermons. There I found his famous sermon on the advantages of written prayers, where he satirized those "who had renounced the communion and liturgy of our church," and where he speaks of their prayers as "heathenish and pharasaical," marked by two things, "length and tautology." And I asked the vicar whether a blush would not mantle the cheek of South

governed by the fear of God that he lived a chaste and virtuous life, and the more we get into the man's soul, the more we see him struggling to subdue his passions and serve his God. Charles may have been an agreeable and well-born gentleman, but cleanliness in heart, truth in speech, purity and honour in conduct, were the last things we could ascribe to him, though his most famous and favoured Court preacher could say, in the man's very hearing, too, that his father, the first Charles, was "a blessed saint, a father to his country; if but for this only, that he was the father of such a son." Milton may have been a Republican poet, who defended the rights of the English people to rid itself, gravely and constitutionally, of an unconstitutional king; but at least he had a soul

"Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free."*

Wycherley and Dryden may have been Royalist poets, who

when he thought of men like Baxter, like Howe, like Bunyan and Milton, who had all renounced the communion and liturgy of the Established Church. The only answer I could get to the question was: "So it seems to us"; and I felt naturally provoked that a man like South should dare to speak disrespectfully of words used by men in the presence of Almighty God, who were, to say the least, his equals in piety. I do think that Burnet had some excuse when he described South as "a learned but ill-natured divine." For not only did he charge, in their supreme act of worship, men who never came into the presence of the Almighty without thought, with being thoughtless men; but he could not speak of Cromwell with his "torn cloak and greasy hat" without saying that "perhaps they were not paid for." Even a man in his own communion, like Dean Sherlock, he sneered at as "a hen-pecked husband."

* The two things that Milton mainly loved were "piety" and "liberty." Piety he described as directed equally "towards God and men," "not vain and wordy" piety, which was to him abhorrent, "but efficacious and active." Freedom he again defined as the same thing as piety, which was to be "wise, just, temperate, self-providing, abstinent from the property of other people, and, therefore, magnanimous and brave," "the opposite of all that is the same thing as being a slave." He feared kingship because it threatened liberty.

graced the Restoration; but the one is famous only for impurities that cause honest men to loathe the tongue in which they are written; and the other for a happy variableness that reflected the changing faiths and fortunes of his time. Nor need we be ashamed of our divines. John Owen may stand alongside Archbishop Sheldon, "a man of no great religion," as Burnet said; Thomas Goodwin need not fear comparison with Bishop Gauden; Theophilus Gale, the very ideal of the Christian scholar, gentle and patient amid persecution and loss, will not suffer even if placed beside Bishop Pearson; John Howe may well blush to be bracketed with Robert South, though the insolence of the Court preacher might notice the blush only to misread it. No; our Puritan age does not call for humiliation and shame; of it every Englishman who is not a bigot is in the heart of him proud. It lasted but a generation, but in great men, great questions, great conflicts, great issues, simple heroism and magnanimous patriotism, it was the most fruitful and illustrious age in our annals. Without it the English people, neither here nor beyond the sea, would have been in liberty, in enterprise, in civilization, in progress, in religion, what they are to-day. And that age was the creation of the faith our churches live by; and was inspired by the ideals they lived, and still live, for. In that hour its capabilities took visible shape, and showed how they could translate the religion of Christ into the character, the ambitions, the achievements, and the institutions of a free people.

(ii) The church of the Restoration, then, is here regarded as in a preëminent degree political and civil; it had, as it were, a dynastic function, became the safeguard of the Crown, the bulwark of the monarchy, and was itself for this purpose legislatively secured and fortified. The men of the Reformation, for religious reasons, legislated

against Rome; but the men of the Restoration, for political reasons, legislated against Puritanism. Their design was, by making dissent illegal, to make an end of dissenters; the result was to change the arena without changing the essential issue of the struggle. It became in form more political and less religious, though it remained in essence religious where most political. Our fathers had to contend for the liberties they had been deprived of; their opponents had to justify the deprivation. Liberty was demanded on many grounds, as the nature of religion, the constitution of the church, the rights of conscience, the claims and freedom of the citizen; liberty was refused on varied grounds, as the divine right of episcopacy, the divine rights of the king, the danger of dissent to the unity of the church and the safety of the State. The struggle was unequal. Our fathers had to wrestle against the powers that were; but these had to contend against the forces that were making history, the Providence that was shaping the present and determining the future of England. . The Revolution ended the divine right of the king; the Act of Toleration ended the ecclesiastical rights that had been based on it; and the church had to seek in the will of the majority, or something equally unstable, a new ground on which to defend its privileges and supremacy. The political conflict has raged for over two centuries, and the end, though not yet, is nigh at hand. The victory is sure, and on some early morn we shall wake to hear the glad bells telling that the strife is over, and peace has come, for an equal and gracious freedom has arisen to reign.

But now the point to be here emphasized is this: for the last two centuries and a quarter we have been forced to accentuate our political doctrine, to claim and vindicate our very right to be. To win back our liberties has been

a tedious and toilsome labour, often in form political, always in spirit and basis religious, the work of men who despised force, and believed in the essential reasonableness of the right. But now, what is the issue of victory to be? Clearly renewed and enlarged obedience to our religious doctrine. As our liberies grow, our duties increase; the less we have to claim from the State, the more we have to do for it and for religion. To have room for the realization of our spiritual ideal is to be under the holiest obligations to realize it.

2. But our duty has been defined for us not simply by our inner history, but also by our outer relations. The struggle for political freedom conditioned our development; the struggle to maintain political ascendancy has conditioned the development of the Anglican church. We, for the sake of religion, suffered under civil disabilities; it, for the sake of ascendancy, suffered under disabilities we may name religious. Onward from the Restoration the church faced the country as a body that had everything to gain by conserving things as they were, everything to lose by change and the forces that worked for it. It was enriched with so many privileges, that political progress could seem to it as but a process of progressive impoverishment. Jealousy for its political mission and possessions would not allow it to do justice to its religious ideal, and so for long it nursed able ecclesiastics rather than godly divines. The revival which came to relieve the spiritual barrenness of the eighteenth century, while it penetrated, and in a measure leavened, the church, was yet alien to the Anglican genius and ideal; and was treated as such, as a thing that belonged to dissent, and was uncongenial with church traditions. And so, while the Evangelical revival was as the very breath of life to our Free churches, it lived as a stranger and pilgrim within the Establishment, and died before a revival

more in harmony with the Anglican ideal. With the causes of the Anglo-Catholic movement, I am not here concerned, though it is well to note that it was partly due to the victory in the State of the very principles for which our fathers had contended. Just at the very moment when it had become manifest that the policy of repression and disability had utterly failed, and failed because the root-ideas of independency had penetrated the State, and converted it first to toleration, and then to methods of equity and freedom; — there came, not an evangelical, but an ecclesiastical revival, begotten, as it were, out of the very essence of the Anglican church, and with the design of making it conscious of its distinctive meaning and mission. And so its authority was magnified, the apostolicity of its orders and doctrines was affirmed, its bishops were invested with a more awful dignity, and its priests with more sacred functions; its Prayer-book was filled with a deeper significance, its services were made to articulate a larger and lovelier faith. The revival showed its essential churchliness in this: it was a divisive as well as a quickening movement, in the degree that it increased life it lessened charity. The sectarian spirit has grown under its influence, and Anglo-Catholicity has made new and sharper differences in English religion. Worship has become more ornate, but brotherhood is less recognized and realized; whether the change be a gain, is not a matter it becomes us to discuss.

II

What, then, is the sum and moral of our past discussion? This is the sum: at the very moment when the Providence of God has so ruled our history as to leave us free to realize our characteristic religious idea, we are confronted by its very antithesis — a resurgent sacerdotalism. And the

moral is like the sum: the moment that has so come is our supreme opportunity, full of all the responsibilities and duties such rare opportunities bring. Our use or our neglect of it will, therefore, determine whether we are a people called of God to do the work that now needs to be done in England. What that work is, is the thing we have now to understand. Our work may be shortly defined as the creation of the new Puritanism; what this is may be best explained and apprehended through its antithesis, the new Sacerdotalism. These represent, not only the old historical antitheses of the church, but the alternative ideas and doctrines of the Christian religion now before the people of England.

1. Our fundamental attitude to the Anglican church is not determined by the principle or fact of Establishment. That is a mere accident, of but occasional significance, destined to an early ending; and certain, when ended, only to leave the two systems the more openly and the more resolutely face to face. There are unestablished Episcopal churches; and the Anglican church disestablished will be Anglican still, in ecclesiastical character and tendency strengthened rather than weakened by the change. The political controversy hides rather than reveals our differences, softens rather than sharpens our essential antagonism. Were it out of the way we should confront each other on the plane of a still more radical and vital opposition; we should be opponents — reverent, generous, and charitable, but certainly clear and resolute opponents in the interpretation of the religion of Jesus Christ.

In saying this I do not mean that we represent different and rival church polities. Episcopacy and Independency are opposed as aristocracy and democracy are opposed; but they concern only the method in which the life ought to be organized, do not concern the agencies and means of its

creation and the conditions of its maintenance. What I do mean is that the native and reigning tendency of the Anglican church, certain to grow the stronger the more she is relieved from the religious disabilities incident to civil establishment, is sacerdotal; while the native and governing principle in Independency, which must, if there is to be life, increase in the degree that religious liberty prevails, is Puritan. And these terms, I repeat, represent fundamental and material differences in our notion and doctrine of religion.

2. What is Sacerdotalism? It is the doctrine that the man who ministers in sacred things, the institution through which and the office or order in which he ministers, the acts he performs, the sacraments and rites he celebrates, are so ordained and constituted of God as to be the peculiar channels of His grace, essential to true worship, necessary to the being of religion, and the full realization of the religious life. The sacerdotal system, with all its constituents and accessories, personal, official, and ceremonial, becomes a vast intercessory medium, held to be as a whole, and in all its parts, though organized and administered of man, so the creation and expression of the divine will as to be the supernatural, authorized, and authoritative agency for the reconciliation of God and man. So conceived, Sacerdotalism is not a question in church polity; it may need bishops, but bishops do not necessarily either imply or involve it. A man may, for many reasons, exegetical, historical, empirical, hold that episcopacy is the true, or the safest, or the best ecclesiastical polity, and yet be strenuously opposed to a priesthood or things priestly. Where the Sacerdotalism comes in is where the man and the institution, with the acts and articles needed for its operation, are made so of the essence of religion that where they are not it cannot be

in its truth and purity; that to belong to it a man must belong to them, that through them, and them only, can God come, as it were, into full possession of the man, or the man into full and living fellowship with God. The difference then, between church polity and Sacerdotalism may be stated thus: the one is a formal, the other is a material question; the one relates to the form under which the Christian Society is to be ordered, maintained, and realized, but the other relates to the actual nature and matter of the Christian religion; what it is, and what is necessary to its being and its work. The question as to polity is important, but secondary; the question as to Sacerdotalism is primary and essential. It signifies, at root, what do men mean when they speak of Christ and the Christian religion.

3. So much for Sacerdotalism in the abstract; let us now look at it in the concrete, as in part realized and labouring after fuller realization within the Anglican church. Its historical basis and framework is the Anglican polity, which it builds on, fills up, and explains thus: It affirms (i) that this polity, with its various clerical orders, is of divine institution. Christ entrusted to the College of the Apostles plenary ministerial authority, sent them as He had been sent, endowed with the power to transmit what He had given, just as He could give what He had received of the Father.* In accordance with this divine authority they created, and filled with duly qualified men, certain orders or grades of ministers. They appointed Deacons to serve in things secular, to care for the poor, to preach, and even to baptize. They appointed Presbyters or Bishops to serve in things sacred, to teach, to guide, to govern the

* "A Father in Christ." Sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral at the consecration of the Bishops of Lincoln and Exeter, by H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L. Second edition, pp. 8, 9.

flock, to celebrate the eucharist — indeed, to exercise full ministerial functions, except in the cardinal matter "of transmitting the ministry." And, finally, they instituted a special order, represented in the primitive Church by Timothy and Titus, whose high function it was to ordain the men chosen to sacred offices.

It affirms (ii) that this order, which is apostolic, survives in the modern bishop, who stands in the direct line of apostolical succession. In Judaism the sacerdotal principle was physical because hereditary, one inherited the priesthood, whether high or common, by virtue of the purity of his blood; in Anglicanism the principle is social and hieratic, a theory of lineal hierarchical descent. Levi was in the loins of Abraham when Melchisedec met him; the Anglican and Catholic bishops were in the spirit of Paul when he ordained Timothy and Titus.

It affirms (iii) that the bishop is necessary to the being of the priest. He alone can ordain the man who possesses full ministerial capacity; men not so ordained may preach, or even administer baptism, but the communities in which they serve "lack participation in those privileges which depend upon a ministry duly authorized by Christ our Lord."* It affirms (iv) that without the priest so ordained, worship in the full spiritual Christian sense is not possible, for on him depends "the validity of the eucharist."† It affirms (v) that the sacraments are the means necessary to the creation and maintenance of spiritual life. Baptism is "the great sacrament of our regeneration"; and what is termed the eucharist is "our chief means of communion with our Lord."‡

And these parts so hang together as to constitute a

* "A Father in Christ," Preface, p. xxxviii. † *Ibid.*, p. 15.
‡ *Ibid.*, p. 15; Preface, p. xxxviii.

logical and consistent whole; the polity is a divine creation, the very form in which God decreed religion to be realized in the world. The episcopate is "organically necessary to the structure of the visible Body of Christ"; "necessary not merely to its *bene esse*, but to its *esse*."* We can, therefore, weave together the ideas into a connected whole thus: without Christ there could have been no apostles; without apostles, no bishops; without bishops, no priests; without priests, no sacraments; without sacraments, no church; without the church, no Christian religion. The theory is sublime and consolatory when viewed in relation to the church which possesses these divine orders, prerogatives and graces. And the gentler spirits that hold it are moved with pity when they turn to those who choose to dwell in regions where are none of "the chartered channels" through which the river of life loves to flow. Yet the pity is soothed by the thought that even "lay-baptism" is valid, and we are graciously comforted by the assurance that it "carries with it a share in the communion of saints, and, much more, a right to bear the Christian name." But lest we be exalted above measure, we are reminded that lacking "a duly authorized ministry," we lack "in particular the precious sacrament of the Body and Blood" of our Lord.† The old saying was, "No bishop, no king"; the new saying is, "No bishop, no priest, and no priest, no church"; and so the last consequence is that the religion of Christ has vital or real and authoritative being for the people of England only as the Episcopal and Sacerdotal Church lives and reigns in our midst.

* "A Father in Christ," p. 13. † *Ibid.*, pp. xxxviii–xxxix.

III

Such, then, in brief and bare outline, is the resurgent Sacerdotalism; and our question is, How are we to deal with it?

1. Well, let me say at once, roundly and frankly, not on the ground that it unchurches us. It may be a hardship to be unchurched — that depends on the right of the person who does it, or the wrong inflicted on the person who suffers it to be done. If we feel pained at being unchurched, it need not mean that we pity ourselves; it may be due to regret that men we respect have so exceeded their rights and so misconceived their duties. To unchurch is a twofold process: it affects alike him that does and him that suffers; and its quality may be the very reverse of the mercy that is twice blessed. The grounds on which we are unchurched will cut off the body that does it from the communion of all the Reformed Churches; and we may well stand comforted and undismayed in so goodly a company. If, then, we are unchurched, though it may grieve the gentle heart that loves to think well of all good men, and to be well thought of by them; yet it need wound no man's conscience, weaken no man's faith, lessen no man's sense of acceptance or communion with God. But while we have never said, and may not say, the Anglican system is false because it is so hard on us and other communions, the sacerdotal attitude may yet raise a deeply religious question. We do not wish our faith to be misjudged; we will not have the mind of our Saviour misconceived and misconstrued; so while it may be a small thing to be told "you are without orders and outside what we regard as the church," it may be a great thing to determine whether the body which says

this is rendering into authoritative speech and act the very mind and meaning of our Lord and Master. The Anglican church best knows what its own history and theory demand — concerning these we have neither complaint nor remonstrance to offer; but we must be allowed to judge its claim and action in the light of the spirit of Christ. Whether it be here a really sufficient and authorized interpreter of the religion of truth and love, is a question we as Christian men are bound to discuss and to do our best to determine; and, happily, it is a question which all can discuss and may even determine.

2. Our question, then, is very different from one that simply regards ourselves, and objects to a system on the ground that it is hard on us; but before attempting to answer the question a precautionary remark must be allowed. We must be fair and just and even generous in our interpretation of the men and the system we have to criticize and to resist. For there is affinity within and beneath the difference: we are Christian and Evangelical, and so are they. The spirit and inspiration of this resurgent Sacerdotalism is religious. It is not the creation simply of reaction, but of a living faith, of a splendid and self-forgetful zeal. It is like the old, yet unlike it — larger, nobler, more generous; under its passion for the past works the spirit of to-day. It has, in a degree unknown before, filled the idea and history of the church with religious contents and ideals, and made the very terms "High Church" convey another meaning to us than they conveyed to our fathers. It does not, as in the time of Laud, make extravagant claims for the sovereign and ally itself with oppression and tyranny; he understood the text which invited men to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness to refer to the garments, to the beautiful array in which the people

were to adore God, or to the beauty of the building where God was to be adored; but our Fathers concentrated their effort on the congregation and imagined the beauty to be moral. But the new "High Churchman" stretches out hands to the people, is zealous in their cause, and has bidden some of the church's most distinguished sons speak brave words on behalf of the oppressed. The party has thus a larger idea of the church, its rights and possibilities and duties, than Laud ever had; and though its zeal for man works under ecclesiastical forms, it is real and redemptive zeal all the same. Ritual is used for the creation of faith; and means by the altars, sacraments, vestures, processions, and postures, to make Christ's presence and work more real to the sense and so to the spirit of man. There therefore is real evangelical purpose in the heart of the ecclesiastical revival, and only as we feel and appreciate this shall we be able to do generous justice to its meaning and spirit. The noble ought to be nobly entreated even while resolutely opposed.

IV

1. In one fundamental respect, then, the new Sacerdotalism and the new Puritanism agree. Both are in spirit evangelical. We say, and they say, the supreme matter is the reconciliation of man to God through Jesus Christ; the great end towards which all the energies of all the churches ought to be directed is to bring Christ nearer to the men who need to be so reconciled. But here precisely our criticism begins — what this Sacerdotalism seeks to do, it fails, and, by its very nature, must fail, to accomplish. It is a means absolutely unsuitable and inadequate to its own end; for it builds faith in God on the church rather than the

church on faith in God. It makes the church so limit and condition God's approach to the soul and the soul's approach to God, that these two are held apart rather than brought together by it; it circumscribes and controls His action; His action is not allowed to fill it, as it were, with His own free and gracious infinitude. To be more specific: — it seeks to give salvation and life through an elaborate mechanism, always liable to be deranged or even broken, rather than through the operation of the spontaneous and sovereign grace of God, and the truths that are expressive of it. God has bound his grace to one Person, and to one Person alone, in the whole history of man; and He has so bound it, not for the purpose of keeping it narrow, but of making it broad; not for the purpose of causing it to flow through certain "chartered channels," which, because chartered, always tend to grow muddy, stagnant, and undistributive, but that it may remain a river of pure water, bursting, as it were, from its spring in the heart of the Eternal, and flowing on in ever statelier volume towards its home in the Eternity yet to be. Christ, I say, is a Universal Person; He is "the true Light that lighteth every man coming into the world."* He is "the only begotten in the bosom of the Father," who hath come forth "to declare Him."† Christ is every man's; every man is Christ's. It is the will and purpose of God that the grace that came through Him be absolutely universal and absolutely free, limited by no organism built and directed of man, dependent on no conditions prescribed and enforced by men.

2. Now Sacerdotalism does two things: (i) by its doctrine of the church it limits the universality of Divine grace. Think, were the organized episcopal and sacer-

* John i. 9. † John i. 18.

dotal churches the only adequate organs and representatives of Christ, the only true qualified interpreters of His truth, what a limitation they would be to His presence and action alike as regards range and reality. We believe that He is everywhere — in every thought of good, in every gleam of truth or word of comfort or touch of healing that comes to man; and, if Christ is to live, our ideas on this point must be enlarged rather than circumscribed. We represent an ancient ancestry; the Anglican church represents the same; but, if history proves anything, it is the absolute insufficiency of that church to the work of realizing in England and for its people the religion of Christ. Without us and the other Free churches would that religion be alive in our midst to-day? Nay, what and where would the Anglican church herself be without the streams of life we have poured into her? without the quickening and emulation that have so often provoked her to zeal and to good works? Grace, to be universal, must be free; to bind it to a sacerdotal organism would be to limit its range, lessen its energies, perhaps to cause its death.

But (ii), Sacerdotalism not only makes the grace of God narrow and partial; but conditions it on imperfect men. The men who have shared in the reproaches of a hard, a limited and unconditional theology, know what is meant when we say: — theology chastised us with whips, but sacerdotalism chastises us with scorpions.* It is better to believe that the grace of God is limited than to act as if it were, or as if its distribution had been granted to imperfect and spiteful men. For how could they be entrusted with so great a thing as the power to administer, the right to give or withhold the means of "our communion with our Lord"? To possess it were to be depraved by it.

* 1 Kings xii. 4, 11, 14.

I would not speak one disrespectful word of Anglican men; they are men often saintly, noble, and generous. But to make a bishop necessary to the being of a priest, bishop and priest necessary to a sacrament, bishop, priest, and sacrament necessary to the very existence, in their fulness and truth, of the church and the religion of Jesus Christ, would require every bishop and priest to be so pure, so holy, so possessed of human pity, so full of Divine tenderness, that men should feel as if the priest-bishop were a very "only begotten Son of God," to whom they could come as unto God Himself. Think what it is to be able to hold and command the approaches of God to the soul and the soul to God; and the more we see into what it means the more we shall conclude that the person fit to occupy so awful an office must be in quality of manhood and reality of Godhood the kin and brother of the Christ. Where God has placed His own well-beloved Son no other can be allowed to stand, especially no imperfect man, liable to error of judgment, infirmity of will, failure in charity, or in truth of spirit and of word. "There is one God and one Mediator between God and men."* A multitude of mediators were as bad as a multitude of gods; the way of the soul to the Father and the Father to the soul must be open, common, free.

V

1. Here, then, lies the fundamental difference — the cardinal truth of Sacerdotalism is ecclesiological, but the cardinal truth of Puritanism is theological. The one magnifies the church, the other magnifies God. The one must have a church that it may have religion; the other must have religion and truth that it may have a church. Sacer-

* 1 Tim. ii. 5.

dotalism may have a splendid idea of the church and its history; but to secure it the idea of God has to be made narrow and mean, adjusted to the spirit and aims and achievements of the institution that claims to be "the chartered channel" of His grace. Puritanism has a broad and generous idea of God, which lifts it above the poor ideal realized within its own and all other churches, and enables it to regard them as humble means to a Divine end, agencies for the creation of a sublimer religion than history has yet seen realized.

2. The sublimity of the sacerdotal idea is sensuous; it appeals to the eye and heart by the wonderful historical structure which has needed so many hands and so many ages to build up. But the sublimity of the Evangelical ideal is spiritual; it appeals to the spirit and imagination by its marvellous idea of God and those purposes of His that needed eternity for their shaping, and time for their unfolding, and will need an eternity for their fulfilment. The ultimate truth, then, through which we live and on which we build, which governs all our thoughts and determines all our ideals and endeavours, is the Eternal and Sovereign Fatherhood, which is absolute and universal in its grace. By Him and unto Him are all things; churches are means in His hands, created for His ends; they are to be judged through Him, He is not to be conceived through them or comprehended by them. Nay, more, not only they, but the religion they exist to realize must be interpreted, not through canons or decrees of councils, not through priests and sacraments, not through bishops and popes; but through — and through only — the truth of the regal and regnant Fatherhood.

3. Now, this fundamental truth gives us a truer and higher conception of the reign and providence of God than

is expressed in any theory of ecclesiastical supernaturalism. We do not believe in a forsaken humanity, which knows God's presence only as it possesses a marvellous and miraculous church; we affirm that nature is everywhere rooted in His real yet supernatural activity; that history everywhere manifests it, for "in Him we live, move, and have our being."* We do not believe in sacraments so little sacramental as to depend for their very being on an immense series of accidents, like the official succession, mechanically regulated, of mortal and fallible men; we maintain that the channels and means of His grace are as infinite in their variety as the ways of His working. Our fathers said: "We must realize a theocratic State; the ideal of the Old Testament is not a sacred mysterious thing intended to remain remote from all reality, but is meant for realization. God ought to be our King, the State ought to be His church, the people ought to stand in covenant relations with Him, His moral right to be their civil and religious law." We affirm the ancient principle, but change the application, and say: "The New Testament ideal is truer; we are bound to realize it, to translate it through our churches into the realities of thought, society, and the State. It does not represent simply a miraculous, but a creative moment; from that moment forward it was God's purpose that His Kingdom should, through the churches of His Son, take creative and corporate being on earth. We deny that the age of miracles is past; it is an age that ever is, for there ever is the living God who inspires the spirits that believe, guides the society of His saints, and never ceases to work among men in behalf of His truth." In this there is a grander theory of the Divine Presence and the Divine Providence than any

* Acts xvii. 28.

ever expressed in the doctrines of Apostolic Succession, Episcopal Grace, or an Infallible Chair. God has never left Himself without a witness. His lines are gone out through all the earth, and His Word unto the ends of the world.

4. The fundamental difference, then, which divides the evangelical from the sacerdotal idea, is theological; the Gospel reposes on the sovereign paternity of God, and His immediate relation through Jesus Christ with all men. But in this is contained a second difference which is as decisive and determinative — the conditions of acceptance with Him are all spiritual and ethical. They are in no respect sensuous and formal, depending on rites observed or external relations established; but universal and possible to all men, they spring out of the very natures of God and man, and what may be described as their primary and essential relations. God is spirit, and man is spirit; He seeks after man, and man feels after Him; and the conditions are such as become those natures and those relations. "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that seek after Him." * Other conditions can no man frame than God has framed: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is begotten of God," † and to be so begotten is to be "an heir of God and a joint heir with Christ." ‡

VI

But it may be said: "All this is abstract; it has nothing to do with religion as realized in history."

1. Well, then, let us become concrete and historical, at the point, too, where history is supremely significant,

* Heb. vi. 6. † 1 John v. 1. ‡ Rom. viii. 17.

the Primitive Church. But if we do go back to it, it must not be to discuss simply whether apostles were germinal bishops, or bishops are evolved apostles, or whether there was an order, impersonated in Timothy and Titus, that was neither Apostolic nor Presbyterial, but a *tertium quid*, the mystic heir to the plenary power which the apostles had received. No; this is a question not merely of certain orders or offices, but of the whole meaning and essence of the Christian Faith. That cannot be a good way of representing Christianity which is not Christ's way. That cannot be Apostolic truth which was unknown to the apostles, and contrary alike to the spirit and matter of their thought. The function of the Pastoral Epistles is not to interpret either the Theology or the church of the New Testament; that Theology and that church must interpret those Epistles. The nature of the function becomes evident when explained through the religion; it is not possible to interpret the religion through the functions, especially when they are made to bear so extraordinary a burden as the full proof of our official Sacerdotalism.

(i) Here, then, our question is: What did Christ mean to do? and what did He actually accomplish? He created, it is said, a visible society, constituted a faith and order of His own. Granted; but what sort of society, constructed according to what idea of faith and order? It was a society of saints, a communion of saved men, called of God to the faith and the fellowship of His Son.* But now a most remarkable thing in the society was this: it was human and spiritual, not hierarchic or hieratic; it was a brotherhood which knew and allowed no priesthood, and was described by terms that denoted a free and equal citizen-

* See the chapters, *infra*, on "the action of Jesus in founding His society"; and "the teaching of Jesus as to His church."

ship, not by terms that implied or required a sacerdotal constitution. In it no man was named a "priest," no material sacrifices were enforced, no ritual was enjoined or provided. In both the teaching and the lives of Christ and His apostles, nothing is more extraordinary than the complete absence of sacerdotal elements and acts. "Sacrifice" has a purely spiritual sense; "prayer," "praise," "obedience," "charity," "the devotion of the living man to the living love that is the highest law," are the only things denoted and described as "sacrifices." The word "temple" is used, but never in a material sense; it applies to the purified man, or the purified society, or to the mystic Person of the Lamb, who is priest, sacrifice, altar, temple, all in one, the means and the seat of the reconciliation of God and man. Now, how comes it that Christ so constituted His society? It could not have been by accident; it must have been of set purpose and by express design. If He sent His apostles to establish and extend the society He had founded, then it was one without any priestly orders or offices, with all the old sacerdotal customs and acts translated into ethical and spiritual ideas. And if, uncertain of His meaning, they were ever forced to interpret His words through His life, what would they find? That He never claimed to be a priest, boasting no priestly descent, and that while on earth He lived remote from the temple. He worshipped without the help of the priesthood, in the company of men pure in heart and strong in faith; and He loved to be alone with the Father, to speak to Him in the simple speech of the spirit and the truth. This independence of the priest, and opposition to his mind and ways, was the very offence that brought Him to the cross. What Jesus was, His society was to be, as

little sacerdotal, as beautiful in its holy simplicity, pure spirituality, and noble devotion to the needs of men and ends of God.

(ii) But the society Jesus founded He named; He called it "the kingdom of God," and "the kingdom of Heaven." Now how is this kingdom described? As one constituted by the very being of its King; it needs but Him to be, and no officers are appointed to make or enforce its laws, to control or conduct its affairs; nor is any provision made for their appointment. It is real, yet ideal; has most actual being, yet can never take visible shape. The sensuous, who look for it without, never see it, for it exists within; the pure in heart see it as they see God, everywhere, and in everything, in the moral energies that work for good, in the moral agencies that cure our ills. It is a kingdom of the spirit, its citizens are the holy of all time, the notes of citizenship are "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."* Now, while Jesus founds the kingdom, His apostles plant churches — and why? Not to be, but to serve, the kingdom; to create its idea within man and its reality among men. It is an error of the first magnitude to confound the churches with the kingdom; they are not distinct aspects of the same idea, but as different from each other as means are from ends. Jesus alludes to the church only twice, but He never ceases to speak of the kingdom; all His discourses and parables are concerning it and what it means. The apostles speak but seldom of the kingdom, and always with awe, as of something peculiarly God's, which may be witnessed to, entered, or inherited, but can never be founded, ruled, or constructed of man. The churches, on the contrary, are the familiar scenes of their activity and concern; their great problems

* Rom. xiv. 17; cf. Gal. v. 22.

are how to multiply, plant, water, teach, rule, purify, energize, and uplift them. These churches constitute a unity, but it is ideal, not actual, through their relation to a common head and service of a common end, not through their articulation into a political or corporate organism. The churches existed for the kingdom, and were means for realizing its ends, making men into citizens, obedient to God, organs of His will; so living in time under the ideals and inspiration of eternity that His will might be done on earth as in heaven. But means and ends had to agree in character and quality; the Kingdom was spiritual, ethical, the realm of faith and love, and the church had to be the same; no system of inalienable orders graded in the way the sacerdotal mind loves, but the beneficence and energies of converted men disciplined and directed towards the conversion of the world.

2. And how were these churches founded, edified, and governed? Was it by men specially ordained and commissioned by the college of the apostles? The man most eminent in this work was Paul, and he was made an apostle neither by men nor through man, but by the direct vocation of God and the revelation of Jesus Christ.* While Paul was the ordained of God, Matthias was the ordained of the apostles; but his election, so far as history knows, was fruitless enough, for we never hear of him again. As his election did not exclude Paul from the apostleship, his orders were either invalid or alienable, and in either case the consequence is alike fatal to their supernatural and sacerdotal worth. But so far as Paul is concerned, the call of God, without choice or act or decree of the apostolic college, constituted his only and sufficient title to the highest ministry. It came before, and it existed without

* Gal. i. 1, 11.

the laying on of apostolic hands: nor did he stand alone. The ministry of Barnabas did not wait on his ordination; Apollos "watered" churches, but there is no record of his ever having received "orders." The authority the Anglican speaks of was never claimed by the apostolic college: there was, indeed, no college to claim it, all our evidence in this matter being in favour of action almost always independent, and often not harmonious. God instituted the ministry, and appointed apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. His vocation and inspiration were larger than the "chartered channels," burst through them, and so overflowed the earth. The man of proved spirit was the approved man, made by the sufficiency of God a capable minister of the New Testament.

Never, then, was any society so free from sacerdotal taint as the Primitive Church; all was spontaneous and spiritual, marked by freedom from the bondage of the letter and the law. Sacerdotalism, wherever it has existed, has done two things; it has so organized and exalted its sacred orders, priesthood or clergy, as to supersede or throw into the background the idea of God as a living and immediate presence for the soul, and it has made formal, ceremonial and moral observances take the place of ethical obedience, moral and spiritual conduct. The New Testament insists on two things, the exact contraries of these: (i) the Sovereign Paternity of God and the absolute freedom of His grace, alike in His saving and in His endowment of man; and (ii) man's worship as a worship in spirit and in truth, or his obedience as altogether moral and in no respect ceremonial. The new Puritanism is but an attempt to realize these New Testament ideals under the conditions of our modern life, and apply them to the spirit and needs

and aspirations of the whole man and every man, as well as to society and the State. Christ hath made us free, and we must stand fast in His liberty that we may the better serve His kingdom and save our kind.

VII

But, now, how are we to do what is our manifest duty, and realize the evangelical ideal, or the ancient and pure religion of Christ and His apostles? Not by controversy; that is a rude and impotent weapon, especially if followed for its own sake. We ought never to have controversy with men, only with false systems, and with what is false only that we may win the fitter opportunity to speak the truth. I protest against a mere polemical attitude, which expresses simply aversion and antagonism to a system that is not our own. I protest against the handling of Anglo-Catholicism in a spirit of shallow mockery, or the small witticism that describes it as devotion to ecclesiastical millinery or a passing fashion in dress. The Anglican men are in earnest; they ought to be resisted by men too much in earnest to do anything but to go right to the heart of the matter, the faith by which the system lives. If they have a truth to offer, let us be prepared with a higher and sublimer truth.

1. Our work, then, to be effective, must be creative, not controversial; we must begin where our fathers began — with God. No age ever so needed faith in the gracious sovereignty of the Eternal Father, who so loves the lost as not to spare, but deliver up to the death for them all, His own beloved Son. I would it were possible to do as much for the Christian conception of God as men do for the theory and ritual of the Catholic or the Anglican

church! Were it possible to place Him in all His Divine love and beauty before the hearts and consciences of men, we should, even in spite of the bonds and fascination of sin, draw them after Him in wondering faith and adoring worship. Magnify God, and the magnificence of churches will grow mean in His presence, their pomp seem tawdry, and their eloquence become dumb.

Then over against their doctrine of the sacraments place the faith in the personal and reigning Christ. He sanctifies all places, makes everything sacramental, speaks to us through all the beneficences of time, in all the needs, sins, sorrows, sufferings, loves of men. His altar is everywhere, and everywhere His sacrifice; in every outcast, in all the afflicted let us hear His voice, saying, "What ye do unto these, ye do unto Me!" His atonement is too universal, too spiritual, too infinite in its worth, to have its meaning or merit, or efficiency conveyed in any outer or material form, and we ought, without ceasing, to show how the very simplicity of our sacramental symbol makes it the more of a reality to the spirit.

Further, over against their official priesthood, let us place the spiritual priesthood, the office and the function at once common and sacred to all believers. If they say, "Ye are no priests" — never mind what they say; but let us feel, every man of us, that we are priests, standing before God for men, before men for God. Let us create in our little churches the feeling, certain to lift them above all littleness of spirit or of speech, that they are priestly bodies, where every man by watching and prayer, by personal communion with God and loving intercourse with men, can help to work the reconciliation of humanity and God. Then, too, over against their organized sacerdotal society, let us place our Christian brotherhood, our

commonwealth of saints, where every man is free to exercise all his rights and bound to fulfil his every duty. And, finally, over against their theory of the continuity of the apostolic succession, let us set our faith in the continuity of religious life, which makes us possess the truth and hold communion with the saints of all the churches, share in and sympathize with all the good of all the ages.

2. It is possible for a man to be strangely loyal to his church; the narrower, or what is, unhappily, the same thing, the higher his doctrine, the more passionate the enthusiasm it will evoke. If he feels that God has constituted his church, that it is built according to a Divine idea, which is expressed in its very framework and unfolded in its outer history, that the priest of to-day and the many hundred generations of priests before him, have come by the miraculous ordination of God, then he may well be loyal, even to the point of extravagance, if such a point be possible, to the church he so conceives. Yet enthusiasm for the past of an organized society, based on the belief that its history is the history of God's action for a people, or a province, or an era, may be intense, but cannot be humane or generous; it may imply a fine historical sense, but it expresses a mean notion of religion, and the God who reveals it. Our notion of the church is a larger and less palpable and measurable notion, for we dare not limit to so mean dimensions His Providence, and the gracious Paternity that controls it. Our loyalty is not to an organized historical institution, which, though large as the Catholic, or rich as the Anglican church, would yet seem to us ignobly small and poor if regarded as a sufficient vehicle for a religion we believe to be of God, but it is to an infinite ideal. These churches are too mean for our devotion, too narrow for our sympathies, too earthly for our aspiration and our faith.

We believe in a society of the saints, distributed throughout all ages, scattered through all lands. We believe in a God who forsakes no man, hates no man, and works as continuously and as graciously without as within the churches that call themselves by His name. We believe that this God has called us to faith and obedience, and has given to us all, whether lay or clerical, sacred ordination by His Holy Spirit, that we may, as true heirs of apostolic grace and channels of apostolic life, preach the gospel of His Son to the men of this lost, yet living world.

3. And now, if we believe in our mission, we must not leave its fulfilment to chance; we must make it our special duty and concern, and work like men who mean to have their ideal realized. If the Sacerdotal idea is to be superseded it must be by an idea sublimer, truer, and more spiritual, and so our need is men who not only believe this idea, but are able so to present it as to win to faith and obedience our cynical and sceptical age. You know what is meant; on the ministry of the next generation the future of our Congregational churches depends. If we are careless or faithless in the making of our men, we simply surrender the future to the prouder and the wealthier church. There is no system that has more historical pride than the Anglican, and none that can so little bear historical criticism; and our men ought to confront it like men who can measure its claims and its worth simply by telling the story of its becoming. But this is not enough; they ought to be possessed and inspired by a living faith, penetrated and governed by the theology that conceives and explains God as the personal and regal Father, who will have all men to be saved; and if they are so possessed or so inspired they will be neither keen critics nor effective controversialists, but something unspeakably nobler — preachers of eternal truth.

Nor is this all; practical work is needed, accomplished by spirits that do not calculate and that seek no reward; work among the lapsed, the outcast, the ignorant, the suffering, the sorrowful, the despised and neglected of men. Churches that do not feel that they exist to save men are nigh unto death. They best serve the State who do most to end the sin and ameliorate the misery of man. The time is at hand when, our great ecclesiastical conflict over, we shall be face to face, not with the Establishment, but with the Anglican church. Let us then make it manifest that we claim every man in England for Christ, and that we mean every man to feel what the grace of God signifies for him. If we so interpret our mission, then we shall accomplish a work that will make it impossible for the sceptre that controls English destinies ever to pass into the hands of a disestablished sacerdotal church, and we shall help to keep it for ever in the hands of the risen and reigning Christ.

IV

ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY AND THE RELIGION OF CHRIST

I

1. CHURCHES and societies, like men, ought to be studied in their actual histories, but through their distinctive ideals. The most prosaic person has in him a vein of poetry which must be found if his behaviour in the higher and more critical moments of his life is to be understood. And the most utter church of the Philistines has its ideal elements, if they survive only as the memory of its ancient or recent feuds with the people of God. It is well to be just even to Philistines; and what they aim at being and doing may better express their spiritual qualities and capabilities than what they actually are and do. The ideal is what every church is directly and altogether responsible for, but its realization is always conditioned, either favoured or hindered, by the conflicts and limitations of place and time. If the ideal is impracticable it is bad and impotent, but where real and living it is realizable; and the struggle towards realization is certain to ameliorate the conditions, whether political, intellectual, moral, or religious, amid which it is carried on. The dream of a golden age, or the vision of a city of God floating before the imagination of man as a glorious

possibility towards which he must with all his energies and through all his ages continue to work, certain that though it ever retreats it is yet being ever approached, is, in its power to repress the worst and quicken the best in him, a more potent factor for good than the best possible methods known to the science of economics for the accumulation and distribution of wealth. Material conditions of well-being are good only so far as realized by men who themselves do well.

Now perhaps the fittest introduction to the study of the action of ecclesiastical principles in history is the study of the ideal, or the aims that, through the polity which can best be described as Congregational, the churches that profess it seek to attain and realize. It is only from this point of view that it is possible to do justice to the meaning and mission which churches as such possess. It is here their positive character comes out, and their polity appears in its true nature and spirit and purpose, not as it seems under the perversities and perversions of the hour, but as it stands, as it were, in the light of eternity, seeking to have the reign or kingdom of God realized on earth, not in an ecclesiastical corporation identified with religion and worked in its name, but by the regeneration of men and the consequent regeneration of the families, the societies, and the States they constitute. The great concern of every ecclesiastical polity ought to be the making of men, and through those it has remade the making of a new heaven and a new earth, wherein shall dwell righteousness. It works therefore through the individual, but not simply for him, seeks his good as a means rather than as a mere end in itself. It believes that as instituted by Christ and as administered by Christian men, it is designed to be the most flexible and educative of polities, the least capable of

being perverted from spiritual and ethical to formal and interested ends. It is, too, able to exercise Christian manhood and teach it how to apply Christian principles to all matters alike of policy and practice, and the best qualified to keep the sensuous elements and accidents of religion in the background, while holding its living truths and creative ideals ever to the front. What can be said in exposition and defence of this belief is the matter that more specially concerns us here.

2. It may be as well that we determine at the outset the meaning and relation of certain terms which are here to be extensively used, like Congregational and Independent, which do not, as here employed, denote a modern denomination. Neither is a very happy or distinctive term, but each is too historical and well established to be displaced. They are not mutually exclusive, rather mutually suggestive, for each directly implies the other. An Independent becomes in its ultimate analysis a Congregational polity, and a Congregational must be Independent. The one term is constitutional, denotes the organizing principle or idea of the Society as well as the form under which it lives and does its work; but the other term is relational, defines and describes the attitude in which the society stands, and must, because of its very constitution, stand to every external authority. A Congregational polity is a polity which regards all legislative functions, whether disciplinary and judicial or dogmatic, as the possession and inalienable right of the congregation, or, in the New Testament sense of the term, the church; an Independent polity is a polity which declares this possession and right inviolable, things with which no alien is free to meddle. The terms are thus strictly correlative and supplementary; while the one defines the nature of the society,

the other affirms its claim to be allowed to live according to its own nature, that it may realize its own ideal.

Now of these terms Congregational has the more significance, yet it suffers from a radical defect; it hides the relation of the polity it denotes to its creative norm, the primitive idea of the church, with all that it involves as to the nature of the religion intended to be realized. The polity which strongly accentuates this idea is not current and conventional, but honours the church by being in the best sense so purely and so distinctively ecclesiastical.* The term "ecclesiastical," indeed, were it possible to restore its simple and noble primitive sense, would best describe the one suitable polity. It is significant that the apostles used a term with Greek rather than with Jewish associations, ἐκκλησία rather than συναγωγή, and it is through its Greek associations that the term must be interpreted.† In Athens

* The word "church" was at the Reformation put under a literary ban. It had been so emphasized as a political and constitutional term that the persons who composed it were lost sight of. Hence Luther translated ἐκκλησία by "Gelmeine" "the commonalty," or simply "the people." He was followed by Tyndale, who translated "congregation," by Cranmer and the other English reformers. "Church" was restored by the Geneva version, though not universally. In Matt. xvi. 18 and xviii. 17 it is rendered "congregation."

† The sentence may be judged incorrect, since the terms differ in meaning, the one expressing an act, the other denoting a result, but both are to start with good Greek, frequent and familiar in the classical literature which was older than any products of Hellenism and without any Jewish associations. While both terms are used variously and extensively in the Septuagint—συναγωγή translating no fewer than twenty several terms, while ἐκκλησία translates but five—each has an assured place in the Greek language, which can alone supply us with the necessary etymologies. Thus ἐκκλησία—whose etymon almost all Greek writers give as ἔκκλητος from the custom of calling out, or summoning by voice, the citizens who constituted the local ἐκκλησία—is used by Herodotus, iii. 142; by Thucydides i. 31; ii. 36, 60; viii. 67, 81, 97; by Xenophon, *Hellenica*, i. 6, 8; iv. 42; by Plato, *Laws*, ii. 764, 850; by Aristotle, Politics, 1282 *a*; and συναγωγή occurs in Thucydides, ii. 18; in Plato, *Theæt.* i. 150 A, where the reference is to the unskilled midwife who brings together or causes to meet the man and woman—cf. Phaedr iii. 266 B.

the ἐκκλησιασταί* were the members of the ἐκκλησία, and to sit, to speak, and to vote there belonged of right to every citizen. And the ἐκκλησία was the symbol of the autonomy and freedom of the city, of all that was healthiest, most patriotic and educative in its life. Where every citizen knew what it was to be an ἐκκλησιαστής, neglected no duty it involved, despised or abused no honour it could bring, lived mindful of all the responsibilities and jealous of all the powers it laid upon him, there the city became the best that was possible to it — that most beautiful of all human things, the home of freemen, whose noblest faculties were all so exercised as to express a spontaneous yet finely regulated order. There have been no cities in the history of the world so rich in great citizens, in splendid patriotism, in culture, art, wisdom, in all fair humanities, as the cities where this ideal was most nearly realized. And the primitive Christian ἐκκλησίαι were societies of freemen, organized that they might fulfil the duties of their religion, realize the ideal of their faith. And every member was a citizen of the kingdom, or an ἐκκλησιαστής, bound to contribute the whole wealth of his renewed man-

where it stands opposed to distinction or division in speech and thought, and where Socrates gives an excellent example of his grave irony—and in Aristotle 1316 B; but as it has not so technical a sense as ἐκκλησία, it has the more extensive use of a common term. Yet while συναγωγή started, like ἐκκλησία, with Greek rather than Jewish associations, its very vagueness as a term helped it to fall more completely into the hands of the Jews than did its rival. While συνάγειν, the parent verb of συναγωγή, translated more than fifty Hebrew terms, ἔκκλητος, which is the root of ἐκκλησία, does not translate one, the only instance of its use occurring where there is no translation, and the verb whence the source came has not even a single representative in the whole of the Septuagint.

* Plato, Gorgias, i, 452 E. Where in immediate apposition we have three pairs of terms: the judges on the bench, the councillors in the council chamber, and the ecclesiasts in the ecclesia, or, as Jowett translates it, "the citizens in the assembly" (καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησία ἐκκλησιαστὰς). Cf. Apol. i, 25, A.

hood to the enriching and ordering of the city or society that was the home of his soul. Now the polity which attempts to recover this ideal, seeks also to enforce all the duties, to affirm all the rights implied, and to work for all the ends it involves. The individuals must be perfected if we are to have perfect societies, and only as we have perfected cities or societies can we have the perfect State. The ἐκκλησιασταί must be restored to their ancient privileges, and made to fulfil their ancient duties, that the ancient ἐκκλησία may be regained, the aboriginal ideal of the Christian church and religion realized.

3. While Congregational denotes the normative principle and constitution of the society, Independent simply describes the relation in which all societies so constituted must stand to every authority external or foreign. The term in its oldest historical use expressed the right of the churches to be independent, as regards interference from without, in order that they might live under the sole authority of Christ. And so Independency here means freedom; "free" is the modern synonym of "independent."* But the course of history showed that States were the most intolerant when the tools of churches; and so free-

* As stated in the text the term "Independent" is not used in a sectarian sense or as denotive of an actual denomination active in the spheres either of religion or of politics; but simply as a symbol expressive of "freedom from external restraint or authority." This is an idea ancient in our language and cogent in our history. The expression appears indeed negative; but under its negative aspect there is a positive determination. It is not freedom from all law, but only from such as appears in "external restraint and authority," and it implies, where the authority is inner, the obligation to obey. It was thus as opposed to law as such, never said to be, even in the hot days of controversy, antinomian, though often declared to be autonomian, i.e. the man was never without the law or against it; it came from the interpretation of himself and must be of his own making to be obeyed. This was the meaning that Henry Jacob gave to the word when he spoke of the church as "an inde-

dom alike from the legislative and administrative control of ecclesiastics, became in the modern State as necessary as

pendent body-politic, endowed with power immediately under and from Christ." And so Hobbes when he argues that in civil government there may be more "than one soul," "not one independent commonwealth, but three independent factions," means that these factions set themselves, in obedience to a law given in their very being, against the will and power of the commonwealth. So when he speaks of the Independents as a body of men who had "killed God's Anointed," he thinks of two authorities, each being external to the other, as coming into collision. But the last quotation suggests a distinction between "Independency" and "Independent." The one as political was the name of a faction; but the other as religious expressed a given attitude to authority as external or uncorroborated and unconfirmed by personal experience. Thus Selden says that Independency is "agreeable to the primitive times, before the emperor became Christian, for in those "primitive times" "every church governed itself"; and he adds, "your Independent would have every congregation as church by itself," i.e. he condemned them for being too faithful to "primitive times," which was rather odd. But the oddness is capable of explanation. If the "Table Talk" represents Selden's mind between 1634 and 1654, it is not too much to suppose that the latter reference was made when "the presbyterian man" had produced "the Independent man." As is independency such are the Independents, the men who are bound to promote the principle. Hence the authors of the *Apologetical Narration* expressly repudiate what they well call "the proud and insolent title of Independency," which had already won its conventional modern sense, and they claimed to be dependent on God, and to do His will, though as Independent they "resolved not to take up a religion by or from any party," and to seek "no other interest or design but a subsistence, be it the poorest and the meanest in our land." The gravest fault which was charged against "Independency" by the man John Milton in his famous sonnet on "the New Forcers of Conscience" called "Shallow Edwards," was its assertion of "toleration and the pretended liberty of conscience." Clement Walker, the politician and M.P., who was besides the professed historian of Independency, says in his attempt at once to discuss and to define it, that it denotes "the general name and title under which all Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and Schisms are united, as Samson's foxes were by their tails" (Judges xv. 4). Yet both Edwards and Walker, however much scorn they may pour upon Independency or the Independents as the men who have "no certain principles save anarchy and the pretended new light"—Edwards counts against the Independents 176 distinct heresies, and says of his personal knowledge "unto these more might be added"; and Walker, who gave fifteen reasons why Independents should hate and depose the King, ended with this: that they who

freedom from kings and their courts in States more ancient. It was this notion of Independency that created the idea

"represent but the common people, assumed power to cut him off who immediately represented God"—if they have occasion to express the idea we have seen to be denoted by "Independent," use the word without scruple (*Antapologia*, p. 172). We can see the process by which the hatred which in England seems inseparable from civil politics, was transferred from the political to the religious domain, where it has abode ever since. John Milton, indeed, in defending the English people against Salmasius, defends also the Independents from the assaults of his ignorance; and he so did it as to formulate the principle which late liberalism accepted: "You find fault with our magistrates for admitting such 'a common sewer of all sorts of sects' Why should they not? It belongs to the church to cast them out of the communion of the faithful; not to the magistrate to banish them the country, provided they do not offend against the civil laws of the state. Men at first united into civil societies, that they might live safely, and enjoy their liberty, without being wronged or oppressed; and that they might live religiously, and according to the doctrine of Christianity, they united themselves into churches. Civil societies have laws, and churches have a discipline peculiar to themselves, and far differing from each other. And this has been the occasion of so many wars in Christendom; to wit, because the civil magistrate and the church confounded their jurisdictions." And he gives them this high character: "the Independents, as they are called, were the only men, that from first to last kept to their point, and knew what use to make of their victory." "You say," says he to Salmasius, "'the English and Scots promised by a solemn covenant, to preserve the majesty of the king.' But you omit upon what terms they promised it; to wit, if it might consist with the safety of their religion and their liberty. To both which, religion and liberty, the king was so averse to his last breath, and watched all opportunities of gaining advantages upon them, that it was evident that his life was dangerous to their religion, and the certain ruin of their liberty." But Milton's "Areopagitica: a speech for the liberty of unlicensed printing," is the noblest expression in our language of the idea the term "Independent" denoted. John Locke, too, after quoting Filmer and Hooker as to their use of "Independent," explains it by the term "liberty," and argues that "the state of nature" is in letters an abstract thing which can only be understood as the antecedent of the present state of society, and which is governed by the same principles as governed the earlier or younger society, just as history has to do with men who once were infants, and who must be supposed to have grown as healthy children into men by obedience to known physical laws. This history of the idea is offered as a justification of the statement in the text, not as a contribution to a special field of ecclesiastical history.

of toleration and achieved religious liberty in England. Political freedom was the creation of free cities, where the citizens exercised the rights and fulfilled with holy zeal the duties of free men; but centralized States tend ever to become despotisms. All empires organized into uniformity and disciplined for conquest have been repressive of freedom, and promotive of manifold tyrannies. Athens free was the mother of genius and art, heroism and devotion; but Athens enslaved was the home of inflated rhetoric and sophistical disputation. And so ecclesiastical polities that build congregations into a corporate system, or a uniform and centralized body-politic, must be intolerant; to allow difference is to foster division, which means death. But the polity which declares each congregation free, a city as it were, constituted by free men, able to make and administer its laws, secure in their ancient privileges and inalienable rights, is a polity that must be tolerant. The spirit that abolished difference and imposed uniformity would pronounce the doom of freedom. Yet independency is not isolation; toleration of difference is not indifference to truth. Free cities have known how to associate freedom and fellowship; and churches know how to combine independency and unity, how to make men live together as brethren, and yet be to each other as the freeborn. They love to be independent of the State that they may the better serve the State; and they are churches that they may develop within and between themselves a richer, manlier, kindlier Christian brotherhood.

II

The ecclesiastical polities which, especially as forms of practical and applied thought, have ever been more divisive than speculative doctrines, may, if the New Testament be taken as the source and standard, be represented as either autocracies or episcopacies, as either presbyterian or communal.

1. The autocracies may have either a civil face like the Russo-Greek Church, which is, as it were, the survivor of the Eastern Empire, and which is the nearest thing still alive to the old relation of religion to the State; or an ecclesiastical face like the Roman Catholic Church, which is, we may say, an empire transformed into a church, with the Pope as the successor of Cæsar, securely seated in the city that gave to the empire, as it gives to the church, its name. In both these cases the reign is nominally rather than really personal; for the Russian Emperor has his cabinet of councillors and the Pope his curia, whose advice both rulers must follow or perish. We are here mainly concerned with the Pope and the curia, and would but remark that the church must undergo many a radical change before it can be conceived as one in the Roman sense, or as finding its spokesman in one man it does not elect.

2. Episcopal authority, which implies a similar idea of unity, though on a smaller scale, to what is found in the papal church, is not possible where the flock is headless; it has been trained to obey and cannot otherwise follow. An episcopal constitution speaks, therefore, of a single head, which if the body be an ecclesia must be an ecclesiastic, while if the church be a state must be the king. Of the first type, the church of Rome is an example; of the second the church of England. And of the civil who were

also its religious rulers, the English Church has had but two, Henry and Elizabeth, who were both Tudors. James I was by birth and education, and possibly also by conviction, a Presbyterian, who never even in England ceased to be a Scot, and read the English dissenter through the stock he himself came of. His son, Charles I, was the same; his grandson, Charles II, was the most dangerous of the race, partly because he was a crypto-Catholic, and partly because he was without convictions. The other grandson, James II, was less dangerous, because while as shameless a sinner as his brother, he was a man with convictions; and so he was no crypto-Catholic, but as one open and avowed he threw away his throne rather than surrender his creed. William never became at heart either English or episcopal, while Anne needed but a year of life to restore the Stuart dynasty. What the Hanoverians are we all know, and can say, that so far as they have been religious, their heart is more Presbyterian than episcopal. For a church then to be ruled by bishops signifies that it ought to be one; but that it may be Catholic there must be a head, an ecclesiastic who presides over the ecclesia and can both speak and act in its name and behalf. Where the Church is the State and therefore national, its head must be civil or simply the king. Should the idea of unity in the church be statutory, it cannot be realized otherwise than as imposed by statute or the legislature. As a step towards proving how the Papacy or Episcopacy arises, there must be proof of the approximation in idea of the Church to the State, or the rise of the notion of unity, which is in its outward form necessary to the State, though superfluous to the Church.

3. The Presbyterian polity is simply the rule or government of elders. It is more Biblical than either of those we have before considered; and it is more natural,

as years produce the experience that statecraft reckons wisdom. We have, therefore, the "elders," who presided over the Jewish community stealing out of Judaism into the Christian church. It is a small matter that the clergy were for centuries known by another name than presbyters; any term old enough to be recorded in the New Testament has in the matter of age a sufficient respectability. And this respectability Presbytery can claim whatever may be asserted of the systems already described. We can here listen to what John Milton says: "So long as the church, in true imitation of Christ, can be content to ride upon an ass, carrying herself and her government along in a mean and simple guise, she may be, as he is, a lion of the tribe of Judah; and in her humility all men with loud hosannas will confess her greatness. But when despising the mighty operation of the spirit by the weak things of this world, she thinks to make herself bigger and more considerable, by using the way of civil force and jurisdiction, as she sits upon this lion she changes into an ass, and instead of hosannas every man pelts her with stones and dirt."* And now I have quoted him, let me quote him again, especially as to his confession of faith in Presbytery: "I fear lest any crookedness, any wrinkle or spot should be found in presbyterian government. If Bodin, the famous French writer, though a papist, yet affirms the commonwealth which maintains this discipline will certainly flourish in virtue and piety, I dare assure myself, that every true protestant will admire the integrity, the uprightness, the divine and gracious purposes thereof, and even for the reason of it so coherent with the doctrine of the gospel, beside the evidence of command in Scripture, will confess it to be the only true Church-government."† So much did

* *Reason of Church Government*, Book II, c. iii. † *Ibid.*

he feel its value that he breaks forth in the first book he wrote after his return from Italy into an apostrophe to the two peoples, English and Scotch: "Go on both hand in hand, O nations, never to be disunited; be the praise and the heroic song of all posterity; merit this, but seek only virtue, not to extend your limits; (for what needs to win a fading triumphant laurel out of the tears of wretched men?) but to settle the pure worship of God in his church, and justice in the state; then shall the hardest difficulties smooth out themselves before ye; envy shall sink to hell, craft and malice be confounded, whether it be homebred mischief or outlandish cunning; yea, other nations will then covet to serve ye, for lordship and victory are but the pages of justice and virtue. Commit securely to true wisdom the vanquishing and uneasing of craft and subtlety, which are but her two runagates; join your invincible might to do worthy and godlike deeds; and then he that seeks to break your union, a cleaving curse be his inheritance to all generations."* Milton changed, we know, and became one of the most active as well as vehement of Independents. Why? The action which changed him we know from his works; but all we have to do here is simply to note the fact of change, for Milton did not always continue in the same mind with which he had begun. This is a fact recognized by the greatest of his biographers, who like Milton at the outset was a genuine presbyterian, and what he was at first he remained throughout. He taught many to see what he himself saw clearly, that Presbytery was wise in the early years of the Commonwealth, that victory made it foolish and unwise, and that in nothing was it more beside itself than in standing by "shallow" Edwards against toleration

* Cf. *Reformation*, Book II.

and everything on which Milton had set his heart. This is a purely historical fact, and as such it is stated and emphasized.

4. The polity termed "communal" is one which lays stress on the common man, who has ceased to be common by undergoing conversion and being incorporated with Christ. What it means and implies every person who studies this paper will understand.

III

1. The polity, then, these correlative and complementary terms denote is the polity which is to be here discussed. But before we can do so we must determine some standard of comparison, by which the polity must be judged as regards its truth on the one hand, and its practical worth on the other. On this point our first, which is also our last, principle is plain enough; the polity of a church must be judged, not simply from the standpoint of the church, whether it be a body which boasts an ancient and continuous history, or a young society organized on the basis of common beliefs; but from the standpoint, on the one hand, of the religion in its purest and most primitive form, and, on the other, of the ends, whether proximate or ultimate, the religion was intended to realize. The religion of Christ existed before any Christian church. All churches exist by virtue of the religion, while the religion exists by virtue of no church. And an ecclesiastical polity has its worth and place determined by its relation to the religion. The political ideal can be good only as it reflects and articulates the religious ideal. The best polity for a church as an aggressive or proselytizing, or as a political and ambitious society, may be the worst for the religion

as a series of Divine truths and principles, facts and doctrines, creating and governing the moral and spiritual life of man. The system that best satisfies the notion of commercial utility or political convenience may be most disastrous to the faith that works by love towards perfect obedience. If the Churches of Christ exist for the religion of Christ, then their polities must be looked at through its nature and ends, spirit and purpose. The polity that best interprets and realizes these is the best church polity.

2. Church polities, which correspond to the names already described, may be divided into two great classes — the Monarchical and the Republican, each being capable of further subdivision. The Monarchical, which is not considered here relative to any civil sovereignty, is either absolute = papal, or limited = episcopal, understood as a system not terminating in a Papacy. The one is simply an autocracy, or organized and absolute patriarchate, while the other is constitutional, or a sovereignty qualified by law. The Republican is either oligarchical = Presbyterian, or democratic = communal. The former is governed by and through its elect, the men who as ministers or elders are its ruling spiritual aristocracy, but the latter is more jealous of delegated powers, loving to act in a body and as a whole, that all may, by exercising high functions, learn high things.

IV

These, then, are the polities we have to study, and to study from the standpoint of the religion and religious ideal of Christ and His apostles. We are not specifically concerned with the bodies that profess these polities, with their statistics, histories, modes of proof, methods of vindicating their right to be and to be believed as of Divine institu-

tion and authority. Our work is at once simpler and more radical; it is to bring these polities and the religious ideals — personal, civil, and social — which they imply and enforce, face to face with the mind, purpose, and method of Christ and the men He directly formed and inspired. The most convenient point at which to begin the comparison is that supplied by the most highly developed and finely articulated polity — the papal; and the convenience of beginning here is the greater, as the only points on which we care to insist are those it has in common with the more modified form of the Monarchical type — the episcopal, specifically the Anglican.

1. The contrast of Catholicism with the Christianity of Christ is apparent enough. There is nothing that so radically affects and determines alike the doctrine, ethics, and politics of a religion as its relation to what may be termed the sacerdotal element or idea. Now the Catholic is a system constituted and administered by a priesthood, devoted to ritual, jealous of its prerogatives, made by an enforced celibacy to feel, as it were, homeless, with all their home affections absorbed by the Church; so graded, drilled, and organized that they form, as Adam Smith said, "A sort of spiritual army, dispersed in different quarters, indeed, but of which all the movements can be directed by one head, and conducted upon one uniform plan."* And this priesthood claims to be necessary to the worship of God; and it claims also to have the right to hear confession, to grant absolution, to celebrate mass, to give or withhold the sacraments, to open or shut the gate of the church, which is to them and theirs the door of the kingdom of heaven. The priest stands between man and God, a mediator, a person who seeks to control the world, that is, by

* *Wealth of Nations*, bk. v, cap. i.

his power over the world to come. But of all this there is in the New Testament absolutely no trace. Jesus Himself was no priest, was without priestly ancestry or associates,* adopted no sacerdotal custom, chose no sacerdotal person, had no relations, save those of antagonism, to the priesthood, and the one thing it gave Him was the honour of its hate and the glorious infamy of the Cross. Nor did He institute any priestly order. No one of His apostles was a priest, or exercised a single priestly function, or uttered a word that hinted at actual or possible priestly claims. The terms they used to denote the offices they held or instituted express or imply no single sacerdotal element or idea. The men who are charged to represent and administer the new faith are named prophets, or apostles, or evangelists, or pastors, or teachers,† or overseers,‡ or elders,§ or ministers,|| or deacons,¶ but never priests. And this is a most remarkable thing, explicable only as the result of most careful and conscious purpose, the more that Christianity stood alone amid the great religions of the time. For the worship of Christ's day was steeped in sacerdotalism; all its great acts and instruments and agents bore sacerdotal names, and were beset with associations and fixed in a system sacerdotal through and through. To institute a polity that had not even a reminiscence of the actual sacerdotalism, where everything priestly was so transfigured into its spiritual opposite as to be only the more completely annulled, to appoint to religious or spirit-

* Cf. Heb. vii. 11 ff., where Jesus indeed is said to be a priest, but after "the order of Melchizedek," not of Aaron, to whom he is set in opposition. Cf. *vv.* 14, 24, 28 (see *Infra*).

† Ephes. iv. 11.

‡ Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2; 1 Peter ii. 25.

§ Acts xi. 30; xiv. 23; xv. 4; 1 Tim. v. 12; Tit. i. 5.

|| Acts xiii. 5; Rom. xv. 16; Eph. iii. 7; 1 Tim. ix. 6.

¶ Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 10, 12, 13.

ual offices that had in name no hint, in functions no shadowiest remembrance of the ancient priesthoods, implies so studious and complete a rejection of all they signified in religious politics as to be demonstrative proof that they had not, and were meant never more to have, any place in the Christian system.

In this respect, then, the religion of Christ was an absolutely new thing; it stood alone among the religions of the world. The notion of a spiritual worship — a pure moral obedience, a service of God by clean hands and pure hearts, a religion without priests, or temple, or sacrifices, or appointed seasons; but with the truths these symbolize, realized in the spirit and expressed in the conduct — had been conceived by the Hebrew prophets.* But in them it existed as an ideal, by Christ it was transformed into a reality. He fulfilled the law and the prophets, translated what they prefigured and predicted into fact, instituted a worship that abolished the temple and all its childish symbolism, and taught man to adore God by obeying Him in spirit and in truth.† And so on the religion of Christ no shadow of sacerdotalism rests; its face is radiant with pure and noble spirituality.‡ By what is simply the most remarkable and perfect revolution in history, because the most completely worked by the wisdom and providence of God, the new religion issued in spotless spirituality from the bosom of what was then the most elaborate and selfish sacerdotalism in the world. One book, indeed, in the New Testament — the Epistle to the Hebrews — attributes priesthood to Christ,§ but it does so with the most significant

* Ex. xx. 1–17; Deut. v. 6–21; Ps. xxiv. 4; Isa. i. 11–17; Micah vi. 6–8.

† Hosea vi. 6; Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7.

‡ John iv. 32.

§ Heb. ii. 17; iv. 15.

limitations. (*α*) He stands in contrast to the Old Testament priesthood, has a special sacrifice to offer in nature different from the Mass, and a service of His own.* (*β*) His priestly life is heavenly, not earthly, the exercise of His sacerdotal functions beginning only within the veil;† and (*γ*) He is the *one* priest, He stands alone in His office and work consecrated by the oath of God.‡ He is Priest, not after the Levitical type, but after its very antithesis, its radical contrast, "the order of Melchizedek";§ and so not only priest and king in one — ethical in both relations, creating by the one peace, working through the other righteousness — but the only priest, constituting the order in which He stands, without another either beneath Him or by His side. The religion of Christ, save as regards Himself, is, therefore, in the most absolute sense, a priestless religion, all the more so that a royal priesthood is ascribed to the collective society or universal Christian man.|| Where all men, by virtue of their faith and common brotherhood in Christ, become priests as He is Priest, the priesthood has ceased to be an office or an order, and become the synonym of Christian manhood, the symbol of the great truth that the reign of official mediators is over, that man and God are now intended to stand face to face as Father and Son. Spiritual worship means immediacy of spiritual relation, and without this immediacy the relation could not be paternal on God's side or filial on man's. Men who are under the sacerdotal law are slaves or babes, not sons.¶

* Heb. vii. 26–28; viii. 3–6; ix. 11, 24–26.
† iv. 15; vii. 16–17; viii. 1, 4; ix. 11.
‡ vii. 17, 21; x. 21.
§ Heb. v. 6, 10; vi. 20; vii. 1–3.
|| 1 Peter ii. 9; Rev. i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6.
¶ Gal. iv. 1–7; Heb. v. 12, 13.

Where the spirit of the Son is there is freedom from the priesthood that there may be fellowship with the Father. The abolition of sacerdotalism was thus necessary to the purpose and mind of Christ; it was the very respect in which His religion transcended all others that made it and required it to be a religion without priests.

2. But the distinctive political as well as sacerdotal elements of Catholicism, whether Roman or Anglican, do not exist in the Christianity of Christ and His apostles. The very conditions of its existence are absent; for the primitive church is no unity in the Roman sense, and it knows no primacy. Its societies are not organized into a single body politic, nor are they subordinated to a single head. There is no statutory authority to bring the churches together, nor has any assembly met to appoint any one to act as a representative. There are the most marked diversities in custom and practice, the most remarkable differences in policy and method. The Jews and Greeks do not readily coalesce; the former stand on immemorial privileges and rites, the latter on their newly-won liberty. Paul and the "pillar apostles"* have different provinces, which are not geographical but ethnical; he will not allow them to invade his freedom, nor will they enforce his liberty in the churches of Judæa. There is nothing he so severely condemns as the attempt to invoke the authority of certain potent names; to swear by Cephas is to renounce Christ.† But while no system could be less uniform, none could be more fraternal. Paul writes to many churches, and many churches confess him their founder and teacher; but his letters are expository or

* There is a touch of irony in Paul's reference to those held in repute as pillars (οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι); "those who seemed to be pillars" is a delicate hint that the men referred to, "James, Cephas, and John," were not what they seemed.

† 1 Cor. i. 12, 13; iii. 1–7.

expostulatory, hortatory or biographical, and as far as possible from speaking with legal or political authority. No man ever had a doctrinal system so carefully articulated, or laboured more to make it intelligible and credible to the societies he formed; yet no man ever so carefully avoided building the societies he erected at Galatia and Rome, Ephesus and Colossæ, Philippi and Thessalonica, Corinth and Athens, into a political corporation. His unity of the faith did not mean organized uniformity. And the same is true of the other apostolic writers. The only New Testament book that seems to dream of the church as a visible and localized State is the Apocalypse, and the city of God is to it not Rome, but Jerusalem. Rome, indeed, is the unholy city, drunk with the blood of the saints, memorable as the scene of apostolic martyrdoms, not of apostolic rule.*

V

1. Into the question as to the constitution and offices of the Apostolic Church it is at present impossible and unnecessary to enter. The positions our fathers affirmed are now coming to be accepted commonplaces. English scholarship, broadened and illumined by German, which here means Protestant, is becoming too critical in spirit and historical in method to spare the old high Anglican doctrines. Cultivated prejudice is, indeed, always most inveterate, dies the hardest, and is bitterest in its death; but a death through more light ought to be an ideal euthanasia. It is a rare thing to find scientific criticism in a Bampton Lecture, still rarer to find it used for a really scientific purpose, especially when that purpose may be described as the proof of a thesis which has been a commonplace with us for generations.† But even more

* Rev. xvii. 5, 6.

† *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches.* By Edwin Hatch, M.A. The Bampton Lectures for 1880. This is a very happy, and, on the whole,

significant of the change in English scholarship, because proceeding from the most typical and the most influential

fairly successful attempt to deal with a deeply interesting problem. We cannot but admire its fine analytical qualities, its delicate appreciation of the various forces at work, and the true sense for history and historical movement that pervades it. He uses very lucidly and successfully the results of the later researches into the guilds and associations, secret or other, of the first century, to illustrate the offices and constitution of the primitive Church, though it strikes us that Mr. Hatch is here, where he is most independent and suggestive, tempted to exaggerate their influence, and to underrate or unduly overlook the larger and nobler influence of the political idea that comes from the free cities of Greece, an idea expressed in the cardinal and determinative terms πόλις and ἐκκλησία. Yet the book is a healthy one, and will help to set the questions it discusses in a fresh light before the Anglican as distinguished from the English student. But we must regret some very serious omissions in Mr. Hatch's lectures, especially his very brief allusion to the vital matter of the sacerdotal order and system that so soon grew up in the Early Church, and the inadequacy of his critical and literary discussions. These omissions seem to us connected with a failure on Mr. Hatch's part rightly to appreciate the various organizing forces at work in their organic unity and movement; and so the reader is not made to perceive the action of these forces on the religion, or their reflection in the literature, with its varying tendencies, and local and temporal differences. The organization of the Christian Church worked a revolution in the Christian religion.

[After a good deal of mental hesitation the above footnote has been allowed to stand as it was first written. In his later years Edwin Hatch was one of my most intimate friends—a friendship, if I mistake not, begun the very year (1882) the above note was written, though before it was published—and the image of him looks down from the mantelpiece upon my desk. He had been in Germany, where he found his work much appreciated; for he was too impartial and had too much of the rigorous conscience of the scholar to be thoroughly appreciated at home, where the present Bishop of Birmingham had, amid much applause, assailed the Bamptons with all a young man's courage and more than a young man's confidence. There Hatch had found a German friend I also knew. The result was his Bampton Lectures were translated into German; and the theory known in Germany—against, indeed, the will of the man who is bracketed with the Englishman—as "the Hatch and Harnack hypothesis" took shape and was gravely and learnedly discussed. Harnack appended to the translation an important note (pp. 229–59), mainly intended to confirm the argument and elucidate the illustrations of Lectures II, III, and IV. The note emphasized Hatch's knowledge, the insight based on it, and the fact that the offices and functions of the church could best be explained and understood by setting the Christian society back amid the institutions

of living Anglican scholars, was Dr. Lightfoot's essay on "The Christian Ministry."* It is as honourable to his candour as to his scholarship, especially as regards the discussions as to the constitution of the apostolic and sub-apostolic church.† His later discussions as to the rise and growth of the episcopate, though marked by a laborious attempt to be impartial and moderate, are often weakened by strained interpretations. He frequently puts modern ideas into ancient terms, uses conjecture for evidence, and cunningly draws from a late document the testimonies he needs. When, e.g. he describes‡ James, "the Lord's brother," as the earliest bishop, or, to quote him exactly, "as a bishop in the later and more special sense of the term,"§ he goes not only beyond, but against the evidence contained in the New Testament, and in his other authority, Josephus.|| The evidence may be instructively

of the time. This was the supreme gift, which will abide when other things have failed, of Edwin Hatch to his time. He was a master of method; and his method is to us significant. It may be a small thing to prove that the Bishop was an evolved treasurer of a religious guild; but it is something to know how best to conceive and explain the church. We do not think the organization and order of the church can be historically understood unless we look at it through the institutions of its day.]

* *Epistle to the Philippians*, pp. 179–269. 4th ed.

† The second phrase is intended as a name for the age succeeding that of the apostles, and the nomenclature of that age is, as Principal, Sir James Donaldson says, "objectionable" (*The Apost. Fathers*, p. 101).

‡ *Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 197.

§ What does Dr. Lightfoot mean when he speaks as he does here of "a bishop in the later and more special sense of the term?" Is the bishopric territorial? If it is so, then who gave him his diocese at first? Or can such things be done in secret? We who are Scots by nature as well as by nation, know that the men of Iona had bishops who had no territorial jurisdiction or territorial designation.

|| *Antiquities* xx, 9, i. There is an enormous mass of literature connected with the reference in Josephus to James, "the Brother of our Lord." There is controversy about what Josephus really said, the state of his text being suspicious wherever it refers to the person, the religion, or the kinsmen of our Saviour. There are three references in Origen:

studied in the proof texts, which are finely suggestive of the ingenuity needed to discover in them any remotest hint of episcopal dignity or authority.* Dr. Lightfoot does not explain how it happened that this earliest bishop loses his episcopal functions at the most critical moment, and is not even named in connection with the most formal and solemn act of the Church at Jerusalem. It is "to the apostles and presbyters with the whole church" that it "seemed good" to choose men "out of the company"† to go to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; and it is the same apostles and presbyters who send the letter to the brethren of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia.‡ It is not without meaning, too, that Paul, when he first goes up to Jerusalem, goes up to visit Cephas,§ who is evidently a person more important to Paul than "the earliest bishop," though he was "the Lord's brother." Again: when Dr. Lightfoot says,‖ "as early as the middle of the second century all parties concur in representing him as a bishop in the strict sense of the term," he does not quite correctly represent the historical significance of his authorities. Does he mean to affirm that the bishop was then what he is now? If we doubt or even deny it, it is because we are pupils who have learned of Dr. Lightfoot. Then what does he mean by including "the canonical Scriptures," especially "the Epistles of Paul" and "the Acts of the Apostles" in his list of authorities? There are only three possible references to James the Lord's

one in the Homilies, Matt. xiii. 15, other two in the *Contra Celsum*, i, 47; ii, 13; and Eusebius is, as he usually is, credulous and uncritical; yet cf. *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 23. There is a careful notice in the *Ars Critica*, Part III, § 1, c. xiv, of Clericus, and in Koessing's *Dissertatio*, 1857.

* Gal. ii. 9; Acts xii. 17; xv. 13 ff.; xxi. 18. † Acts xv. 22.

‡ Acts xv. 23–29. § Gal. i. 18. ‖ p. 208.

brother in the Acts,* and but one more in the Pauline Epistles;† and in no text is he spoken of as a person in lawful authority. Then the other authorities are as bad; they are Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, the Clementines, Clemens Alexandrinus, also as quoted by Eusebius, and the Apostolic Constitutions. We begin at the end, and say the last is rather a curious authority, which one would have thought impossible, especially when it is made to speak as to the middle of the second century. Clement's literary activity falls at the end of the century, his birth about the middle. And Dr. Lightfoot does not tell us that Clement's notion of the bishop was by no means the episcopal or church notion. He does not think of the man as made "just" by his office, but as placed in it by the church because "just." His great man was not the ἐπίσκοπος, but the γνωστικός; the latter was fit to be enrolled εἰς τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων.‡ And this was entirely in harmony with the faith and order of the then Alexandrian church, where the head of the catechetical school, who stood in the true apostolical succession, was a greater man than the bishop. Dr. Lightfoot's other two authorities are in reality one, and the one is for purposes of proof worse than none. The ultimate authority is the Clementines, and they are not simply "gross exaggerations," but fictions, written with a doctrinal purpose which could be fulfilled only through an episcopate which magnified James;§ Hegesippus quite

* Acts xii. 17. It is a little more than doubtful whether this is "James, the Lord's brother"; xv. 13; xxi. 18.

† 1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal. i. 19; ii. 9, 12.

‡ Stromata, iv, 31; vi, 13.

§ The Clementines, both Homilies and Recognitions, have been well described as a religious "Romance" which no one would cite as an authentic witness. I wish it were possible to say that it is the first or the last writing of its type; yet its place in early Christian

evidently echoes in his fragments the Ebionitic tradition which has its perfected form in the Clementines.* And there are certain peculiarities of the tradition Dr. Lightfoot either overlooks or does not sufficiently emphasize. It embodies elements and stories most certainly mythical. It would be most interesting to know whether Dr. Lightfoot accepts the account of James's personal habits, or the still more extraordinary story as to his death, his being cast down from the wing of the temple and stoned — a deed said to be done by "the Scribes and Pharisees"; while the more historical Josephus attributes the death to Annas, the chief priest, and the Sadducees. Then the position of James in the Church at Jerusalem differs radically from the traditional and customary episcopal one. He holds it

literature can be ascertained and fixed. Like all documents connected with the formation of the primitive church, it owes much to Baur and his school. He has treated it as what it unquestionably is, a product of Judeo-Christian thought, and as intended to commend it and the organization it requires. It is embraced in one of his early programmes, which deals with the origin and doctrine of the Ebionites or Jewish Christians; in the famous discussion, which may be said to have founded his school, on the *Christus-Partie* in Corinth; in his treatise on the Manichæan Religious System; in his *Die Christliche Gnosis*, a whole chapter—pp. 300–414—is dedicated to the discussion of what is termed the "Pseudo-Clementine System." He returns to the subject in his *Paul the Apostle*, and in the first volume of his *Kirchengeschichte*. The question he did not discuss was one in pure literature, whether the Homilies or the Recognitions was the prior; and here I may confess myself a follower of Hilgenfeld, who here opposed the cleverest member of the Tübingen school, at any rate after its master and founder, and held that the Recognitions were earlier than the Homilies. Ritschl sees in the "Recognitions" an evidence of the richness of Judaism, which supplied more than one element to the creation of Christianity (*Entstehung der Alt-kath. Kirche*, 130 ff, 448 ff). While the book was throughout heretical, it is yet, through its apotheosis of Peter, a main source of Catholic tradition.

* If Lightfoot had had more of the serpent and less of the dove in him, he would have kept clear himself of the Clementine literature and laboured to save from it a writer like Hegesippus. Possibly his qualities were too dove-like for the partisans of his own communion.

not as an apostle or a successor of the apostles, but as a kinsman of the Lord, and his successor is appointed on the same grounds. His case supplies no parallel to the historical episcopate, and his office, if office it can be called, can in no respect be traced back to any institutive act either of Christ or His apostles.*

2. We may say, then, the Divine right of episcopacy is dead; it died of the light created by historical criticism. It is open to no manner of doubt that the modern bishop has no place in the New Testament. The same office, according to the aspect in which it was viewed, was variously designated,† bishops and presbyters were identical,‡ and one church might have many bishops or presbyters, just as it might have many deacons.§ Each church was a brotherhood; supremacy over it was conceded to no man. Government, indeed, existed, order was enforced, but the men who ruled were the men who served, and the church was in all matters of judgment and discipline the ultimate authority.|| The apostolic is the simplest and least organized of societies; a society where the freedom of the Spirit is largely loved and its gifts highly esteemed, where official clergy are unknown and the man who can

* It may be thought I, who was a young man when the text was written, too freely passed judgment in a prior note on the Bishop of Birmingham for his criticism of Hatch's Bampton Lectures (p. 163). Let me at once frankly confess a kindred sin, and say I feel ashamed of the way in which Lightfoot is here treated. I can only plead in extenuation that Lightfoot had not then published his great work which put him in the front rank of modern scholars, on Ignatius and the Ignatian Epistles. And I am not alone in the judgment passed on Lightfoot's work.

† *προϊστάμενοι*, 1 Thess. v. 12; Rom. xii. 8; *πρεσβύτεροι*, Acts xi. 30; xiv. 23; xv. 2 ff., etc.; *ἐπίσκοποι*, Phil. i. 1; *ποιμένες*, Eph. iv. 11; *ἡγούμενοι*, Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24.

‡ 1 Tim. iii. 1–2; cf. v. 17; Titus i. 5–7; 1 Peter v. 1–2; Acts xx. 17 18, 20.

§ Phil. i. 1.

|| Cf. 1 Cor. v. 3–5; 2 Cor. ii. 5 ff.

teach is free to speak,* and the man most honoured is the man who most loves. There is no primate in any church; even the apostles do not claim an administrative and executive authority above and apart from the churches.† Discipline is to be exercised as in the presence of the apostle and in the name of the Lord, but by the collective and collected society.‡ The liberty they enjoy in Christ is inalienable, and to be Christ's is to be introduced into a brotherhood too real and too spontaneous to accept the bondage of any officialism, however consecrated or endowed.

The primacy which thus in the apostolic age belonged to no man, or city, or church, is even more completely absent from the mind and speech of Christ. His most familiar idea is the kingdom, His least familiar the church. The society he institutes is a kingdom; "called of Heaven," in opposition to the empires of earth, the secular monarchies that lived by violence and grew by conquest; called "of God," in opposition to the kingdom of darkness or the devil, the reign of evil in and over man. But though He institutes, He does not organize His kingdom, speaks of it rather as incapable of organization, appoints no viceroys, governors, or officers; simply proclaims the truths and laws that are to create the reign of God in the heart of man. The term church He uses only twice; once in what may be named its individual sense, as denotive of a single assembly or constituted congregation,§ and once in the more universal sense, as denotive of His collective society.‖ It is only by the most violent exegesis that this latter can be made to seem to promise preëminence to

* Acts viii. 4; xi. 19–21; 1 Cor. xiv; Rom. xii. 6–8.
† Acts vi. 3–6.
‡ 1 Cor. v. 3–5.
§ Matt. xviii. 17.
‖ *Ibid.*, xvi. 18.

Peter; but if it did, what then? It can in no way help the claims of Catholicism; for there is no proof that the promise had any reference to Peter's successors, no proof that Peter had any successors, absolutely none that they are the popes of Rome.*

VI

The question as to the social ideal here rises: Has Christianity any ideal for society? If so, what is it? and does it harmonize with those ideals we have classed as religious and political, and already discussed?

1. To discuss it even in the inadequate fashion which is alone possible here may lead us into the province of ethics, with all its bottomless quagmire of problems; yet, whatever may be the relations of theology and ethics, we know, on the authority of Mr. Matthew Arnold, that religion without morality is inconceivable. Now, religion has a double significance for morals: (*a*) the individuals who profess it must have, as moral men, ethical natures. (*b*) As the individuals are, so must the society they constitute be; the society and the individual must correspond, and without an ethical ideal alike fail of their end. In this region the real has its feet on a fact — the Christian religion could not have been apart from Judaism. Its prior history and the history of the people of Israel are one; what Judaism was Christianity became, with an idea in its heart both religious and social. The social idea in Judaism is, indeed, one with the religion, which is a fact the Mosaic law witnesses to. In this law the distinction between the moral and ceremonial is more than a distinction between laws. What is

* One has only to turn to the Recognitions, iii. 66, to see how much Catholicism owes to the Clementines, and how miraculous an atmosphere Peter lives in. As to actual miracles, see x. 10.

called moral is intended for man; what is called ceremonial is intended for a special class, the priesthood. We thus find one law faced by another, which are thus distinguishable: (*a*) Religion conceived as worship is in the hands of a special family, who in birth, in life, and, as a rule, in death are beset with ceremony, which may have, indeed, a moral purpose, though a purpose not understood of those who observe it. But (*b*) the two persons, or God and man, related in religion are alike moral; the morality of God involving that of man. All God's laws, therefore, which define His own character and conduct as well as man's, are ethical. What we call the ceremonial law is limited to a class; while what we term the moral law is not thus limited, but is intended for man as man. The suitability of the moral and the unsuitability of the ceremonial to man was, as a matter of fact, known even in Judaism, which believed that the God who gives the law was more important than the law He gave.

It follows (*a*) that religion must be moral because God is and man ought to be; (*b*) as the individual is, so ought the people to be, i.e. a religion is in an equal measure the concern of the individual and of society; (*c*) moral law in Judaism may be said to have consisted of duties man owed to God, to himself, and to society; fulfilment of one set of duties implied fulfilment of each of the other sets. Hence the command: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me," signified that God alone is, that man was bound thus to recognize God, in which recognition the people or the State was bound to participate. From this it followed inevitably that man could make no image of God; for God had made one of Himself, and no other could be. In Isaiah there is a graphic picture of the carpenter and the blacksmith, and each, as necessary to the making of an idol, maketh it out

of blocks of wood and pieces of iron.* The idol being made, men fall down and worship it, impute to it a sanctity and a power the separate blocks of wood and bits of iron had not nor could possess. The law which forbids any man to make any graven image speaks rather of man as a being who can worship and who ought to worship none save God, since in making all things He made even him. The God who is described as jealous thinks so well of man that He cannot bear to think that he is deceived in the person he worships. And so man is forbidden to take the name of God in vain, which he does when he professes yet fails to worship God, who expects the men who worship Him to be real and honourable. Man is also commanded to keep the Sabbath holy. As Dr. Lightfoot says in the essay before quoted: "The celebration of the first day in the week was necessary to stimulate and direct the devotion of the believers." One day set apart for the worship of God is therefore the consecration of time. So, too, with the command: "Honour thy father and thy mother." "Charity begins at home," we say, forgetful that it ought not to end there. And where father and mother are honoured, all other persons are accounted honourable. For he who despises his parents despises also the race. And the law which selects duties man owes to God and to himself, selects also duties he owes to society. The things he has to refrain from doing are at once personal and social evils; for what are murdering, committing adultery, lying or bearing false witness, stealing, coveting, save sins against God and self and society? The higher man rises, the more absolute become his duties and the keener his sense of obligation, which means that man undergoes the very process he has applied to God, who morally

* Isa. xliv. 10–17.

improves as time goes on; for His sublimity becomes majesty, His righteousness turns into love. He is a moral Sovereign of moral men. The search for worshippers becomes simply a search for men who are capable of imitating God. Thus none but good men can serve a good God, who loves moral beings to serve Him, and who alone on earth and in time can save moral men.

2. Law as moral, and therefore as social, was one of the most splendid gifts which Judaism bestowed upon Christianity, and it was as a gift all the more splendid that it carried with it the idea of ordered growth. To conceive man as made in the image of God was to conceive him as like Deity capable of moving ever upward — at least, in the case of God not in Himself, but in the eyes of men. The inner was thus made a reflection of the outer, and man became, both in human eyes and in inward experience, more perfect as a moral, a social, and a civilizing being. To complete this idea, therefore, a more perfect religion than Judaism was necessary, and this was found in Christianity. Jesus was Himself the new law, and love of Him supplied a notion which impelled onward, a thing the law had no power that could do. As the Son of Man He stood as no man's son at the head of Humanity, where He appeared as the type of man. He became thus the impersonation not only of Deity, but of duty; and man, as his supreme end, has to become Christ-like. He proved, personally, how God could be grace and truth; and could therefore transcend the limits of race. As Jesus in Himself was more than Moses had been to his people, His life was, as it were, an impersonated law; the teaching which unfolded the meaning of His person may be described as ethical and social. His love was more, therefore, than a motive impelling man; it made Himself for an ideal which man was bound to realize.

3. Our primary concern, then, is with the person and teaching of Jesus. As to His teaching, it may be said to have articulated His own character, particularly in His dependence upon God. He begins His career as a teacher by calling disciples and teaching them. His fundamental principle is: "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect."* He also teaches that man should not be as the flowers of the field, which bloom to-day and to-morrow are cast in the fire to be burned. For men ought to repeat the righteousness which God has prescribed, which reflects God's own character. To say, therefore, that men are to be perfect as God is simply to say that they are to be righteous as He is. As to His person, Jesus came to found the kingdom of heaven, or a brotherhood which articulated a sonship that in its turn expressed a Divine Fatherhood. Men, as members of one family, became brothers, and so stood to receive Christ's teaching. Christian virtue is simply the manner of acting, which corresponds to the idea of man as the child of God. Man, in other words, stands within the household of faith, and as such his duties are more than personal, and his virtues must be as his duties are. Jesus teaches the lawyer who comes running to Him to ask what commandment is the greatest thus: "The greatest commandment is to love God, and the second is to love your neighbour as yourself."† The question then became: "Who is my neighbour?" To which Jesus replied by the parable of the good Samaritan, in which the man who fell among thieves was rescued by neither priest nor Levite, nor a Jew according to the flesh, but by a man who, as a Samaritan, was despised as an unholy person.‡ The man who tempted Him was constrained to say that the neighbour was he who did the neighbourly thing and

* Matt. v. 48. † Mark xii. 28–34. ‡ Luke x. 30–35.

showed mercy, not the unneighbourly.* As is the teaching of Christ such is the teaching of His apostles. To die with Him is to be raised together with Him, and to live unto Him is the same as living unto God. Every son of God is thus a brother of man. Enough has been said, therefore, to show that neither the idea of religion which Rome has cultivated, nor the idea of episcopacy which is shared in common by both the Roman and the Anglican churches, can in any measure fulfil the social and ethical ideal of Christ. Not that Rome has had no idea of Christian virtue. It has had; but the virtue has been either statutory or ascetic. As statutory it falls back into Jewish legalism; as ascetic it can only throw the man back upon himself without making of him a beneficent force for social amelioration. Nor can the polity which we have seen to be faithless to Christ's ideal be reconciled with the affinity of all Christian brethren; for a man who stands easily above others is a mere creature of statutory or civil law, not of the internal fitness which goes towards the making of the Christian man. While, therefore, neither theory, whether religious or political, is compatible with the social ideal of Christianity, we can further say that both keep it back instead of helping it forward.

* Luke x. 37.

V

HOW THE RELIGION OF CHRIST GREW INTO CATHOLICISM

I

OUR past discussions have brought us face to face with a curious problem — How has a political and sacerdotal system so complex, so immense, so inclusive as the papal, risen out of a society so simple, spontaneous, and unorganized as the apostolic? or, how has the priestless, kindly, sanely domestic and socially human, and therefore moral, religion of Jesus developed into the hierarchic and celibate sacerdotalism of Rome?

1. It is impossible within our limits to deal adequately and exhaustively with this problem, but one or two points may be noted which indicate the oldest tendencies and signs of change. These are found outside the New Testament, not, indeed, in the most ancient and authentic extra-canonical literature, which may here be termed primary; but in what we may term the secondary literature, which is more or less spurious and corrupt. In Clemens Romanus, for example, the church idea is thoroughly apostolic. In the individual church, episcopacy, in the modern sense, is quite unknown, 'order is loved, "the overseers" or leaders, who are also named "the presbyters and deacons," are honoured, and have authority over the people only as they worthily fill the office they have received, in harmony with apostolic custom and ordinance.*

* Ch. xliv. In this same chapter occurs the verse (1) which Rothe used as one of his great proofs for the apostolic institution of the episcopate (*Die*

As to the ministry there is no reference to any bishop in either the Roman or the Corinthian church; no notion of the church save as a society of God's elect; no idea that any man or body of men has the right to control its action, or possesses any claim to jurisdiction over its affairs. As to the relation of the churches, Rome claims no primacy over Corinth, demands no obedience from it, but simply writes a letter of fraternal expostulation and advice. Church speaks to church, not bishop to bishop, or presbytery to presbytery, the writer absolutely suppressing his own personality that the church may the more emphatically speak. The occasion of the letter is significant; the church at Corinth had deposed certain men, bishops and deacons, from office. Its right to do so is never even by implication questioned, the complaint and remonstrance being simply this — the act is unjust, for the men are holy and blameless. So completely is the modern notion of bishop absent that the same persons are evidently meant by the terms ἡγούμενοι, πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι.* Thirty years later this plurality of persons in the office and variety of name for it come out quite as strongly in Hermas, where we find the terms, πρεσβύτεροι,† ἐπίσκοποι,‡ προηγούμενοι,§ πρωτοκαθεδρῖται,|| used to denote

Anfänge der christlichen Kirche, pp. 374–92). His interpretation is so fanciful and forced that it remains his—too peculiar to become any other body's. Even Dr. Lightfoot, though his own essay owes so much to Rothe, and he is so strongly tempted by the fineness of the theory, holds the interpretation to be "unwarranted, and to interrupt the context with irrelevant matter" (*Epis. S. Clement of Rome*, Notes to ch. xliv. Cf. *Philippians*, pp. 199 ff.). See also Gebhardt and Harnack's *Pat. Apos. Opera*, Fascic. i, pp. 71 ff. Baur (*Ursprung des Episcopats*, pp. 53–61) examines exhaustively Rothe's interpretation, as does also Ritschl (*Entstehung der altkatol. Kirche*, pp. 412–15. 2nd ed.). Donaldson [ed. 1874], *The Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 171–5, discusses the point briefly, but impartially.

* Cf. cc. i, xliv, xlvii, liv, lvii. † Vis. ii, 4. ‡ *Ibid.*, iii, 5.
§ *Ibid.*, i, 2. || *Ibid.*, iii, 9.

the overseers of the churches. In the last reference and term the Shepherd evidently means to be ironical and admonitory. He means to reprove the struggle after the preëminence, which to him is typified by the chief seat or highest place, and so he elsewhere describes the man who exalts himself, and wishes to have the *πρωτοκαθεδρίαν* as one who is a prophet only in seeming.* While Hermas shows a change, not indeed unresisted, in process at Rome in the first half of the second century, Polycarp helps us to see the same in the East. His epistle to the Philippians presents a remarkable phenomenon — he seems in the superscription to distinguish himself from the presbyters who are with him; but in the epistle he neither mentions nor in any way alludes to any bishop in Philippi.† The church there had its presbyters and deacons, but no person that could be described as a bishop.

2. The change thus seen at work appears in a completer and more emphatic form in, on the one hand, the Ignatian Epistles, and, on the other, the Clementine Recognitions and Homilies. These are, indeed, very dissimilar productions, but this only makes their agreement — if bishop means the same thing in both — on the point in question the more significant. The former, at least in their earliest and least corrupt form, belong to the first, the latter to the second half of the second century. The interval that divides them from Clemens Romanus is simply immense. The Ignatian Epistles are a standing problem and perplexity to criticism; some of them are certainly spurious, all of them are largely interpolated

* Mand. xi. Cf. Luke xiv. 7–14, in particular verse 10 is to be studied. Matt. xxii. 2–10; xxiii. 4–12; Mark xii. 38–39; Luke xi. 43; xx. 46.

† See Lightfoot in *Ignatius and Polycarp*, i, pt. ii, p. 380. As to reasons which keep Polycarp silent as to the episcopal office in Philipp., cf. vii, viii, and xi.

and hopelessly corrupt, but all the more they are significant of changes that were secretly, but effectually, transforming the Christian Church. The Clementine works, on the other hand, are less a textual and literary puzzle, but quite as great an historical one; they are more homogeneous, also more heretical, but no more authentic. These works represent two distinct yet related tendencies: the Ignatian Epistles are without Pauline spirit, though anti-Jewish; the Clementine are Petrine or Jacobean; though each works towards a Jewish end. Both are significant and effective of ecclesiastical change, but the Ignatian is more Gentile and ethical, the Clementine more Judaic and legal. The tendency in both is towards a corporate unity, which is secured and symbolized by the ἐπίσκοπος. In both the bishop is a necessity to the church, embodies and, in a sense, creates it. In the Ignatian Epistles he is the soul and source of order, the efficient agent in worship; who honours him honours God, who refuses to hear him refuses to hear God, whose vicar or substitute he is. In the Clementine Homilies, the Church, like the State, means a single ruler — many kings cause many wars — and is compared to a ship whose master is God, whose pilot is Christ, whose chief oarsman is the bishop, without whom it cannot carry its passengers into the haven of eternal blessedness. The Epistles* describe the bishop as εἰς τόπον θεοῦ προκαθήμενος; the Homilies† say of him, ὁ προκαθεζόμενος Χριστοῦ τόπον πεπίστευται. The idea is in both the same; the Bishop presides in the place of God; he sits in the chair and occupies the place of Christ. In both he creates unity; but the unity he creates is not the same. Thus within the agreement there is a most significant difference; the

* Ad. Mag., vi.

† Hom. iii, 66. Cf. Recognitions, iii, 66. Ep. Clem. Ad. Jac., 17.

Ignatian bishop is the bishop of the given church, or congregation, made by the church he rules, without any right to be, apart from it; but the Clementine bishop is kinsman and representative of the Lord, possessing the rights and authority of Him whose representative he is, making by his very presence the cause he champions apostolic and Christian. With the first a second difference, no less significant, is connected. The Ignatian bishop is mainly of political importance, the symbol of order in discipline and worship; but the Clementine is mainly doctrinal, the vehicle or agent of a distinct theological tendency. The episcopal idea was not fully elaborated till the two tendencies were united, and this union, which was strictly Western, we see in Irenæus when he argues that a special order or class was needed for the transmission of the apostolic doctrine. His skilful argument had been anticipated by the author of the Clementines, and so the grand depository of truth and safeguard of orthodoxy was fitly enough the product of the earliest and most anti-Christian heresy.

II

1. That this is the simple and strict historical truth becomes evident when we compare the two sets of documents for the moment before us. The Ignatian Epistles have a political and disciplinary tendency, but the Clementines a distinctly doctrinal purpose. In the former the great concern of the bishop, what he has zealously to seek, is unity, the most precious of things. In order to secure it he must be patient with all men, studious of the weak, vigilant, prayerful, faithful, standing fast in the truth, discerning the times, being specially watchful of the people

and mindful of all that pertains to the care and cure of souls, to the regularity and regulation of worship. These epistles are possessed with a great fear, the fear that the Spirit may be too varied in His manifestations. Order is to be created by each church having a single head, lawlessness repressed by law being made to reside in a single person. Nothing in its way could be less apostolic, less Hebrew in its suspicion of man, less Greek in its fear of freedom, than this attitude of mind. The epistles are quite without the fine respect for Christian freedom, the noble faith in Christian manhood, in its essential and ultimate reasonableness, which ever characterizes Paul. The belief in outer and political as opposed to inner and spiritual methods, in an administrative human will as opposed to a constraining Divine love, in a legal uniformity as opposed to a spiritual unity, is the belief that distinguishes, almost immeasurably for the worse, these Ignatian from the Apostolical Epistles. We have come into another and lower atmosphere and find the enthusiasm of the apostle superseded by the fanaticism of the churchman.

2. The spirit and tendency of the Clementines are very different. They are written in opposition to Pauline or Gentile Christianity, and in the interests of Ebionitic or Judaic. They embody the spirit and doctrine Paul contended against in his Corinthian, Roman, and Galatian Epistles; and thus they represent men who wish to do two things (α) bring the old into the new economy, and (β) make the gospel a continuation and extension of the law. They can do this best by personalizing authority, exactly in the manner so severely rebuked in first Corinthians and Galatians; and as there, so here, the names that are conjured with are those of James and Peter. James and his brother apostles are made the only accredited teachers, who

bestow by ordination the right to teach. The ἐπίσκοπος ἐπισκόπων is James; he is the ultimate authority, and whatever he does not allow is heresy.* By this means the freer and more universal Christianity can easily be dealt with; it has only to be represented as in antagonism with the original apostolic brotherhood. Argument is not needed; history is argument. In these Clementine Homilies and Recognitions we have the Ebionitic version of the apostolic history; it is a late, unauthentic, and almost purely imaginary version; but only on this account the more significant as to what the Judaizing party wished Christianity to be, and as to how they hoped to realize their wishes. Their hopes were in an authoritative person, in a personalized unity. If Moses could be superinduced on Christ, if the Levitical legalism could be placed over the gospel, with all that the Old implied in contrast to the New as to the dominion of the letter and the bondage of the spirit, then there might be hope for the victory of the ancient. And only by the agency of an authoritative person could this be done; and he, of course, was expressly created for the work. The law was incompatible with freedom. "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty"; and where men feared this liberty, a freedom diffused through every unit of the church, they met it by the institution of an episcopal priest, who was to be the basis of order, and the symbol of unity, the vicar and voice of God.† Episcopacy was thus the product of faithlessness; it grew out of a double disbelief (α) in the

* Recog. iv, 35; Hom. xi, 35. Peter is the speaker, but James is in both cases commended. The utmost care is to be taken that no one who does not come from Jerusalem and bring a certificate from James, "the Lord's brother," be received as a teacher. No other than he who brings such a testimonial is a "fit and fruitful teacher," or can give the "grace of baptism"; i.e. enter clothed in spotless raiment to the wedding-supper of the Lamb. Allegorical exegesis came into being with false doctrine.

† Ignatian Epistles. Ephes. vi.; Trallian, ii.; Smyr. ix.; Mag. iii.

sufficiency of the gospel to save the men who were enslaved by sin, and (β) in the power of the Spirit to guide and control the men Christ had made free.

III

1. Once these ideas found a footing in the young society, their development was inevitable. The development was not, indeed, uniform; it was more rapid in Syria and Asia Minor, more gradual in Greece and Alexandria and Rome.*

* One of the things which an ecclesiastical historian must reckon with is the influence of geography upon the constitution of the Christian Church and its growth. This influence was a fact which the late Bishop Lightfoot knew—he was too thorough a scholar to be ignorant of it; yet when knowledge became inconvenient, no man could forget it more completely. He must have known the distinction between ancient and modern times, yet he continued to speak of the earlier bishop as a bishop "in the later and strict sense of the term," and his account of the Episcopate in his learned work on Ignatius (vol. i., pt. ii., pp. 375–390), shows that he well knew the distinction. He understood also the differences, as regards the episcopal offices and duties, between the eastern and western churches, as well as the relation in which the episcopate stood to heresy and heretical opinion. What he calls "the strange audacity of writers like Daillé," who rejected the Epistles because he thought episcopacy could not be earlier than "the beginning of the third century," and because he knew the bishops Ignatius described were "wholly different" from those who reigned later, and of whose rather cruel tender mercies he had had personal experience, he himself accepts, agreeing wholly with Daillæus. In the personal argument Lightfoot "strangely" agrees, though he does not observe on what is to us cardinal, that it was mainly in the matter of the episcopate that the churches in Great Britain, notably the Celtic, which stood in most organic connection with the east, differed from the Rome of Gregory, Augustine of Canterbury, and Theodore. But he notes in detail the points in which the Ignatian differ from the modern Catholic bishops, as (α) "they are not priests"; "throughout the letters there is not the slightest tinge of sacerdotal language in reference to any bishop." "The only passage in which a priest or a high-priest is mentioned at all is Philad. ix." The exegesis which refers it to the Christian ministry is careless; a more careful exegesis refers it to Christ. (β) Nor are they monarchs, "lords over God's heritage"; the bishop has no authority without his council (Philad. viii.), and submission is equally required to the presbyters (Ephes.

This is as was to be expected, and is in harmony with the origin and rapid growth of the high episcopal doctrine among the heretical sects of the East, especially those Judaizing sects that were so strongly opposed to the spiritual Christianity of Paul. But though the tendency became so common as to grow irresistible, the old customs and beliefs struggled hard for life, and died slowly. While the bishop became the symbol and source of authority, who

ii. 20; Mag. ii. 7; Matt. xiii.), and to the deacons (Polyc. vi.). And (γ) "There is no trace" in the letters to the diocese of a bishop, "properly so-called"; "it is a mistake to suppose that Ignatius is called 'Bishop of Syria' in Rom. ii." In a note the famous phrase is explained as "the Bishop belonging to Syria," or "from the distant east," where "the genitive denotes not the extent of his jurisdiction, but the place of his abode." "Episcopacy has not passed beyond its primitive stage. The bishop and presbyter are the ministers of a city, not of a diocese." And (δ) "the unequal development of the episcopate" is also emphasised. It is acknowledged that the episcopate which Ignatius knows is confined to Asia Minor. Of the seven letters which bore his name, six are addressed to churches in Asia, and are full of exhortations urging obedience to the bishops; but the other epistle, which is a letter to Rome, is entirely free from any such command. And there is here no inconsistency, for it entirely agrees with "the information derived from other trustworthy sources." The episcopacy "developed in Asia Minor" was earlier than the episcopacy developed in Rome; Bishop Lightfoot ought to have emphasised the differences and the causes of it, and he would have found that for so complex a result there were more causes than one. It did not need all his wealth of learning to show that the east knew the bishop before the west; but two things we needed to know were (α) why the bishop in the east so differed from his brother in the west, and continued to differ, and (β) why the eastern was so much earlier than the western development. While the names agreed, the things differed; and there was no need for learning so vast and thought so massive to prove that the ancient bishop had nothing in common with the modern except the name, and that the bishop who had no diocese and owed his very being to the church, had his modern analogue rather in the pastor of a congregation than in what we commonly know as the bishop of a diocese. But the point of the criticism is both literary and geographical, though most of all the latter, and under each, whether literature or geography, two facts have been here emphasised, though not unduly: failure, in the one case, to explain the facts (α) the difference between the ancient and the modern bishop, and (β) the contrasted developments of east and west. He has therefore in the latter case to state what he does not (α) the

alone could ordain, without whom neither baptism nor the eucharist could be celebrated, yet we see in Tertullian's silence as to his functions, how the right to administer these still lingered in the community;* and even in Cyprian traces of the original equality of bishops and presbyters can be discovered.† But various conditions combined to favour the new development. The political evoked the sacerdotal tendency, and together they became the main factors of a movement that effected a radical revolution in the spiritual and priestless religion of Christ. The change, indeed, was slow and gradual. The oldest Judaizing heresy was legal in the manner of the Pharisees, but not sacerdotal as were the Sadducees; and as legal it laboured to introduce circumcision, but not sacrifice, the law of the scribes, not the order of the priesthood. The very Clementines, with all

reason of the growth in the east, and (β) why Rome should be in this matter an exception to Asia; and (γ) how it happened that a city which gave its name to the church which has the episcopal order most highly developed, should yet be slower to welcome a change in the dignity of the ministry than a ruder church. On another point I have a criticism also to offer. While not wishing to defend the critical school of Tübingen, I think more highly of it than did Lightfoot, who knew how to be just as well as generous to an opponent; and I deprecate the statement, which is as incorrect as possible, that its members as modern critics conceived the episcopate "as a monarchical office, which developed more rapidly at Rome than elsewhere." Baur was too intelligent a church historian so to think; though he would have done so had he been merely polemical. And so he said it was characteristic of Rome, not only to love unity, but also "den Schooss der Einen seligmachenden Kirche für alle der Aufnahme Fähigen im weitesten Umfang zu öffnen."

* In the De Corona iii. Tertullian argues that even unwritten tradition is adequate as proof, and in evidence he cites (α) Baptism which is only undertaken before the congregation and its President, (β) the eucharist which the Lord commanded and we all observe. In an exposition of Romans vi. 3–4 in the De Resurr. Carnis he speaks in a way that would have pleased the apostle Paul about dying to sin and living to righteousness. Cf. also C. 48, as well as the whole of the Treatise on Baptism which contains both the author's view of the historical conditions and a statement of the reasons that induced him to write.

† I shall speak more fully a little later about Cyprian.

their zeal for Jewish Christianity and aversion to Gentile, stand remote from the sacerdotal idea; they speak of Christ as more illustrious than any priest, and only once apply to Him the term High Priest.* The faith of the second century was like the faith of the first, as is proved by sayings like those of Justin Martyr, "We Christians are the true high priestly race of God";† or those of Irenæus, "All righteous men have entered the priestly order."‡ The universal priesthood could not be official, could only be spiritual in its character, acts, and functions.

2. But the political and sacerdotal tendency created an order or class so specially and exclusively concerned with religion as to be necessary to the organization and administration of the church. The κλῆρος came to stand over against the λαός,§ and the more the distinction was emphasized the more sacred functions became the special possession of the clergy; and so the notion of sanctity got associated with the office and dissociated from the person. The κλῆρος was one order, special,

* Recog. i, 46–48.

† Dial. 116. Justin's own phrase is, ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινόν γένος ἐσμὲν τοῦ θεοῦ. The idea is expressed repeatedly—God has sworn to Christ, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." Psalm cx. speaks of the Messiah, not of king Hezekiah, and He is, according to it, an eternal priest. The fact that God accepts no sacrifice "except through His priest," is made to prove that Christian prayers are sacrifices agreeable to God (116–117), and Malachi i. 10–11 is quoted to prove that God utterly rejects both the priests and sacrifices of Judaism.

‡ Adv. Hær. iv, c. 8, § 3. What Irenæus himself said is thus given in our version, "Omnes enim justi sacerdotalem habent ordinem." The sentence occurs in an exposition of Luke vi. 3, 4, or Mark ii. 25–26. The Greek version which John of Damascus used substituted "righteous King" (βασλεὺς οι ἱκαιος) for "Just persons" (justi), but our version is not only more in keeping with the argument but with the theology of Irenæus.

§ The distinction comes from the LXX. κλῆρος translates 8 Hebrew terms, while λαός translates 17. Yet so far as my reading has gone κλῆρος never denotes the priesthood, while λαός almost uniformly denotes "the people."

consecrated, elect; and the λαός another order, common, secular, profane. If the clergy were necessary to the being of the church, they were also necessary to the realization of religion; and so there was not only the gravest of all schisms introduced into the body of Christ, but the centre of gravity was changed; and all movements, evolutional and organizing, regulated by the legislative and administrative order rather than by the Divine and living Head.

3. In this notion of the κλῆρος, so utterly unknown and alien to primitive and apostolical Christianity, a whole new sacerdotalism was involved, and waited only time and opportunity for evolution. And these were not denied. The moment given official persons are conceived as necessary to the sanctity and truth of worship, collective and social, and in order to its fit performance formed into a special body or class — that moment a priesthood has been constituted. The birth of the idea in the Christian Church signified the victory of heathen and Jewish customs and ideas over the truth and kingdom of Christ. Without the peculiar political development we have traced, this victory would have been impossible; with this development it was inevitable. Neander thinks that the idea of an official priesthood came into Christianity from Judaism.* Ritschl, on the other hand, derives it from the inability of the Gentile Christianity to understand the fundamental truths of the gospel.† The two positions do not exclude each other; both are necessary to the explanation of the result, and neither is sufficient alone. Mental tendencies common to Jew and Greek were the efficient factors of the change, the political development supplied the conditions of their

* *Church Hist.*, vol. i, pp. 270, 271. (Bohn's Ed.)
† *Altkathol, Kirche*, p. 394.

action, and the relation, at once filial and supersessory, of the new religion to Judaism, furnishes the norm or form of the idea to be realized. Jew and Greek alike esteemed the sacerdotal the sacred; what was not sensuously holy was not holy at all. Both alike knew the priest, but neither knew religion without him; and thus were not so disciplined and exercised as to be able easily to comprehend so pure and spiritual a thing as a religion without priests. If the church had been allowed to remain as it had been made by Christ and His apostles, it would have educated men into the spirit of the new religion, have taught them to exercise the spiritual and royal priesthood granted to universal Christian manhood. But the special religious class, with its graded orders, directly suggested the ancient priesthoods, and the idea thus suggested found at once expression, expansion, and authority from the relation in which the New Testament was conceived to stand to the Old. The one was the type, the other the antitype, and logic, which is never so rigorous as when it works in the collective mind, drove men to seek in the antitype a parallel, or copy of every element they found in the type. In the apostolical age, as became its exalted standpoint, the symbols of the old were conceived as fulfilled in the spiritual realities of the new; the visible and carnal sacrifices, temple, priesthood of Mosaism, were replaced by the living sacrifices, the invisible temple, the universal priesthood of Christ and His Church. But the men of a century later were too sensuous to comprehend this exalted ideal; they could better understand the new as not the spiritual fulfilment, but the actual reproduction of the old. Old Testament prophecy is the historical basis of apostolic Christianity, but Old Testament legalism, as lower and more sensuous, was more intelligible to the Gentile, because more in harmony

with the unethical heathenism, so rich in priests, in which he had been nursed. This, indeed, was a point where Jew and Gentile could most sympathetically meet, and unite in the effort to translate the new back into the terms and conditions of the older faith.

IV

1. These historical movements and mental tendencies, viewed in their reciprocal action, made the rise of a new priesthood natural and, in a sense, inevitable. It was more familiar and sensible, more in harmony with universal and immemorial custom, to speak of the person active in religion as a priest than as an elder, or teacher, or preacher. It was an inconvenient thing to men who had to prove the truth of the new religion by the authority of the old, to find the one culminate in a priestly organization, while the other had no organized or visible priesthood whatever. Thus Clemens Romanus* uses the high priest, priest, and Levite of Judaism†

* About Clement little is known; he wrote his epistle, and having caused it to become, himself ceased to be. He is a voice, and nothing more. Though a companion of the Apostles, yet he is unnamed in the New Testament. He is not, though Origen and Eusebius (H.E. iii. 4, 10) are of a contrary opinion, to be identified with the Clement mentioned by Paul in Phil. iv. 3. Still less is he identical with Titus Flavius Clemens, a nephew of the Emperor Vespasian, whose wife, the famous Domitilla, was of the same family as her husband. Our Clement probably was a freedman of the relative of the imperial house, and had taken his master's name. This may be the reason why he is always spoken of with respect, though it is evident that he could not have been the bishop or pastor of the Roman Church unless he had been a man of conviction and virtue. While in the judgment of antiquity the actual author of the epistle which the church at Rome sent to the church at Corinth, his name does not occur in it; he simply obeys the community, which makes the epistle all the completer as a mirror of the time.

† The passage which is most significant is the following: and here I cannot do better than give Lightfoot's translation:—"For unto the high-priest his proper services have been assigned, and to the priests their

to prove and illustrate his idea of order in Christianity; and though he does not find a parallel priesthood in the latter, yet his argument shows that he was saved from this simply by the still prevailing apostolic constitution of the church. But once the political tendency had created the clerical order and made the bishop the cardinal person in worship, authoritative in doctrine, executive in discipline, the basis and symbol of unity, then the conditions existed that not only allowed, but even required, the sacerdotal tendency to transfer the Jewish priesthood, changed in name, but unchanged in spirit and essence, into the Christian church. The act of translation, open and confessed, meets us strangely but instructively enough in Tertullian.* Two

proper office is appointed, and upon the Levites their proper ministrations are laid." And then Clement xl. adds, indicating a distinction which was destined, with a changed connotation, to play a great part in future developments: "The layman is bound by the layman's ordinances." The point is significant, were it only as expressing the controversy that divided the church at Corinth. The difficulty as to the Lord's Supper or seasons which Paul was attempting to vanquish and overcome, is exaggerated; and he finds that as the places were, so the persons are by whom he would have them administered. The sense of the above quotation is well represented by the paraphrase which Lightfoot gives in his notes on page 120: "In the law of Moses the high-priest, the priests, the Levites, the laity, all have their distinct functions." It is well, indeed, to remember "the laity has its own functions." Under this term the people of God as a whole are to be understood; and this we have to remember in a connection where Lightfoot adds that "of bishops, properly so called, no mention is made in this epistle." In his notes on page 123 it is also said, that: "There is no distinct reference to the Christian ministry in ἀρχιερεύς" but only "an argument by analogy." How then does it exist? "The answer to this seems to be that, though the episcopate appears to have been widely established in Asia Minor at this time, this epistle throughout only recognises two orders, presbyters and deacons, as existing in Corinth." And with regard to "the late development of the episcopate in Corinth," reference is made not to the Greek population and the Greek character of the city, but to his own dissertation in Philippians, pages 213–214, and to his Ignatius and Polycarp, page 562 ff.

* Tertullian is correctly enough described in the text. He was a Montanist by nature and by birth; a Jew by education and disposition. God had made him the man he was; a lover of freedom, whose inspira-

rival tendencies struggle in him, the Montanist and the Jewish, and though the former prevailed in what we may term the sphere of life and practice, the latter penetrated and tragically transformed his idea of religion. The term *sacerdos* grows familiar to him.* The presbyters form an *ordo*

tions were religious impulses; a man who believed in religion and in the equality of men. Yet he was educated in law, believed in it, and was inclined to obey it. He, therefore, believed by nature that all his inspirations were from God, and so he became a Montanist, a man who had faith in freedom and inspiration; but by education he had faith in law as that which God had made for man and the ordering of his life; and so he was a Jew. And so he adhered to Montanism which was free and inspirational; and yet to Judaism, which was legal and statutory. Hence in all his polemics he was religious and inspirational, and in all a believer in order; and both tendencies were alike marked in all his writings. Hence he conceived Christ as a second Moses who comes to teach and enforce a new law. Hence He appears as preaching the "novam legem." Besides this general phrase Tertullian has particular phrases which mark him as an adept in Roman law. Thus he argues, there is "lex non scripta" an unwritten law, which he also names "primordialis," or "naturalis," which he says, in the true spirit of a Roman lawyer, is a law which statutory or positive cannot repeal. He also names the "naturalis" "lex communis," and affirms that he so names it because it is "in publico mundi," written of God on tables of the heart that all men may read and obey (De Corona, 6). He elsewhere argues that God owns both law and prophets; that He enforces duty in the one and faith in the other, and is maker of the nature which is as good as law to those who have not any written law. The Gospel has its root in the law (Scorpiace, 50.).

* De Pudic. 21. Tertullian's argument is characteristic, almost Miltonic, indeed, in plainness of speech and frank irony. He says "the forgiveness of sins is the work of the church through its most spiritual men; it is God's work, not the priest's (*Dei ipsius non sacerdotis*)." He also argues that it is not wrong for a body to be washed by the priest before baptism who becomes then, in a sense, a *pollinatorem sacerdotem*; (for the meaning of *pollinatorem* in Tertullian cf. Apol. 13). In his appeal to the people Tertullian describes the heathen and the Christian mysteries, and asks whether the profane can be expected to understand where the intelligent who are within do not, or to put it as he does, "what the priest (*sacerdos*) does not know." (Ad Nationes, i. 7; in Adv. Marcion, iv. 9). After Lu. v. 14 is quoted, Christ is described as *catholicum patris sacerdotem*. Other phrases used by Tertullian are "blind priests," "priests of peace" (De Spectac. 16), "priests of modesty" (De Cultu Fem. ci. 12), "priests of Gehenna," and "priests of evil suggestion."

sacerdotalis,* and the bishop is *summus sacerdos*,† and *pontifex maximus*.‡ And Tertullian was here symptomatic of the tendency active throughout the Church. Hippolytus §

* De Exh. Cast. 7. The argument of Tertullian is as full of instruction as of interest, and contains one of our earliest distinctions between "priest" and "layman," which it traces to a recent act of the Church. The passage is practically an exposition of the law which said, "a bishop shall be the husband of one wife." The men who enter "the sacerdotal order" (*in ordinem sacerdotalem*)' must be men of one marriage; but men are mistaken who think, "what is not lawful for priests may be lawful for aymen." For the question is promptly asked: "Are not laymen priests?" And in answer Revelation i. 6 is quoted. The presbyter is as the layman is, being chosen from his ranks; and so the conclusion is reached, "ergo pugnare debemus ante laicum jussum a secundo matrimonio abstinere, dum presbyter esse non alius potest quam laicus semel fuerit maritus."

† De Baptis. 17. Tertullian after the *summus sacerdos*, adds the remarkable phrase, *qui est episcopus*; but, in his own manner, he qualifies the statement by saying that "presbyters and deacons" can baptize as well as the "summus sacerdos," though "not without episcopal authority." Even laymen have the right [his] to baptize, a right which the Roman Church has jealously preserved to this day. I have repeatedly called attention to this fact showing (i.) how a great historical church like the Roman can be more generous than one recent like the Anglican; (ii.) human nature is stronger than the strongest organized church, mightier even than logical consistency. For grant that baptism is necessary to salvation, then when no authorized person is present to administer the rites that shall save the child, either parent is empowered to do it. One of the aphorisms we owe to Tertullian occurs in this chapter: *Episcopatus æmulatio schismatum mater est.*

‡ De Pudic. 1. Tertullian's Montanism saved him from falling a complete victim to the idea of an official priesthood. No Father pleaded more strongly for the universal priesthood of Christian men. The *Pontifex Maximus* of the last reference is ironical, but on this account all the more significant of the claims advanced by the person satirically described as the *episcopus episcoporum.*

§ Refut. Omn. Hær. i. Proem. There is to be no attempt to determine here of what church, whether Roman or Western, Eastern or Arabian, Hippolytus was a bishop, and whether he was one, or only a presbyter. The one thing we have to do with here is the way in which he reflects the organization of the church in his day, and by reflecting helps on its development. We hardly can imagine that a writer so deservedly despised in his own day will be highly esteemed in ours. All I can do is to cite him, and express the hope that the chapter cited may find readers.

denotes his office by the terms *ἀρχιερατεία τε καὶ διδασκαλία*. Cyprian, of course, goes further, and his bishop is uniformly *sacerdos*, his associates *consacerdotes*, and the presbyters are *cum episcopo sacerdotali honore conjuncti*.* Of the ancient "holy" or "royal" priesthood, which was common to all believers, he appears never to have thought, but to the bishops he applies the Mosaic ordinances relative to the tribe of Levi and the house of Aaron.† In the Apostolic Constitutions the bishop is frequently designated *ἱερεύς*,‡ and twice *ἀρχιερεύς*.§ These terms signified not only the rise of a priesthood within a once priestless religion, but the genesis of a new order of ideas. Obedience ceased to be moral and became legal, worship ceased to be spiritual

* Epp. lxi., iii., lxv. Professor E. W. Watson, in an essay on "Cyprian's Style and Language" in *Studia Biblica*, iv. 189–317, says that "four terms are used for bishop." "Episcopus," "Sacerdos" have "only this one sense." "Sacerdos" is often used simply "because the name involved an argument and a claim" (pp. 257, 258).

† Epp. i., ii. iii.; iv. vi.; lxv.; lxvi.; lxvii.; lxxii.; lxxiii. Dr. E. W. Benson, who, as we read on his title page, was "sometime Archbishop of Canterbury," says with equal grace and generosity: "It is comprehensible how the sentence of Cyprian"—which I understand to refer to a sentence at the top of the page: Episcopatus unus, episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus—"could be vivisected and injected with corruption till it seemed to yield a sense contrary to its original force . . . . and to the leading idea of its author. But that Tertullian's scornful parody of some Bishop of Rome's assumption—Pontifex scilicet maximus, quod est episcopus episcoporum, edicit—should have worked round into becoming the actual title and style of his successor (*sic*), exhibits a feat of that brilliant imagination which even itself could never have realized," page 197. He does not quote after Tertullian (De Pudic) the edict which remitted the penalties of adultery and fornication "over which no woman could write *bonum factum*." Much, however, may be forgiven to a man who has the courage to say that neither "in the Apostolic Fathers nor in Justin, nor in Clement of Alexandria," is there any clear development of their opinions on priesthood, while as to Cyprian "the Bishop is the sacrificing priest," and the priests "of the Jewish functions were our predecessors," 31–9; and what is that but to say what has here been argued?

‡ E.g. ii. 27; 34, 35–6; iii. 9 is against the function of women in baptism, and is an excellence of how the history and legislation of the O.T. governed those of the N.T. (xi. 15, 18). § ii. 27–57.

and became sacerdotal. There cannot be a *sacerdotium* without a *sacrificium*, and so new modes and kinds of sacrifice had to be invented that the priesthood might live. All that Christ most hated in Judaism entered and took possession of the faith that called itself by His name. His Church ceased to be a society of the like-minded, where the freedom of the Spirit reigned, and became a stupendous sacerdotal *civitas*, or State, where the priesthood claimed to be *dispensatores Dei*,* and governed in His name for their own ends.

2. This attempt to describe the process and analyze the courses and conditions of early ecclesiastical development has already led us too far, and we must not allow it to tempt us to go farther. Enough to say, everything favoured the growth of the hierarchic polity. The dream of universal empire that Rome had so nearly realized supplied the Roman church with an ideal; over against the *Civitas Roma* rose the *Civitas Dei*, making men its citizens by baptism, now a priestly rite, and giving to the enfranchised a title to heaven. As the Empire decayed, the church stepped into its place; as the one decreased, the other increased in its ability to maintain order. The more its politico-sacerdotal agencies and activities were exercised, the more they were developed. The supremacy of Rome passed to the church; the Pope superseded Cæsar, and exercised ecclesiastical functions, more imperial than any political functions his predecessor had ever exercised. Culture had died, and with it criticism — which, even when severest and least friendly, is most serviceable to the church, which is ever more able to dispense with the apologies of her sons than with the criticisms of her enemies. States and dynasties were too unstable and short-lived to offer resistance to her arrogant claims. Civil power was ever changing hands, new provinces or peoples were ever coming suddenly to the front,

* Cyprian, Ep. lix. 7.

and were ever being as suddenly forced to the rear. But above all changes the church sat, watching all, profiting by all, multiplying her sensuous sanctities, enacting and enforcing her sacerdotal laws.

V

1. But now these historical discussions have only helped to bring us face to face with our real problem, How did these changes affect the religion of Christ? Did they only the better preserve it, or did they work a revolution in the religion, suppressing, where they did not supersede, its most distinctive qualities? These are here the really determinative questions. It is a small thing to prove that a given church has a continuous history, that it has an unbroken tradition, that its teachers stand in the direct line of descent from the apostles; the cardinal and conclusive matter is to prove that this history has been a continuous growth in the religion, and not in any vital respect away from it. It is a matter most insignificant to make out that a given polity was the polity of the primitive churches; but it were a matter of the very highest moment to make out that the polity of these churches is the permanent polity, because the most fitting vehicle for the realization of the religion they were founded by and founded for. The polity of a church can never be divorced from the faith it professes, for it means, if it means anything, the application of its religious principles and ideals to society, and their application in the form, not simply most suited to the society, but best adapted to secure their realization. This is the only point of view from which we care to discuss the question of ecclesiastical polity, because the only one that does justice to the sphere and mission of the churches. What does not deal with them as the living prophets of the Eternal, the active

and beneficent representatives of Christ, the expositors in word and act of the Divine idea for humanity, does not deal with them according to their intrinsic nature. But this involves the very essence of our contention — the polities of the churches must be studied through the religion of Christ, must be appraised and judged by their ability to articulate His truth, incarnate His Spirit, and realize His ends.

We come, then, back to our problem — How did the evolution of the sacerdotal polity affect the Church as the vehicle and exponent of the religion of Christ? Let us attempt briefly to answer this question as regards certain of the most distinctive features in what we may term (1) the doctrine; (2) the ethics; and (3) the politics of the religion.

1. Doctrine. Faith was here cardinal and apostolic. In its most general sense it meant the free and rational receptivity of man, standing, open and trustful, before the spontaneous and redemptive energies of Deity. These energies as collective yet personal were termed "the grace of God." This is the happiest phrase ever coined to express as a unity the relation between the Divine essence and the Divine will, or the beatitude and the benevolence of God, to denote that glad necessity of nature which determines a Being of infinite happiness to create happiness, and seek to save His creatures from the misery they themselves had caused. And the God of Christ and His apostles was "the God of all grace," which means, that He was a God whose joy was to create joy; but the only joy possible to Him and His creatures was where they consciously stood in the most personal and trustful relations to each other. The man who did not believe could have no joy in God; the man who has no joy in God forbids, as it were, God to have joy in him. Hence grace had as its necessary correlative, faith. Where faith did not stand first

in the order of human duties, grace could not stand first in the order of Divine truths. Hence the apostles preached a grace which demanded faith, or the response of the soul in filial trust to the beneficent self-communication of God. But faith implies the exercise of thought. To ask it is to appeal to the reason, to seek to persuade it, as independent and free, by reasonable words in the methods of reason.

And the apostolic preachers were most reasonable men; the greatest of them was one of the supreme dialecticians of the world. They held that "without faith it was impossible to please God."* For on faith everything depended, and out of it all issued. "By faith" men were "justified with God," † "saved," ‡ "renewed," § "sanctified." || The only righteousness God approved was the righteousness of faith. ¶ And the whole notion of religion stood connected with this central idea. It was a matter of the Spirit; the spiritual man was the religious man; ** and the men of faith were the men of God, who had done His will and His work in the world.

Now how did the sacerdotal polity affect doctrine, especially the doctrines of grace and faith? Did it preserve to them the place, the prominence, the functions they held in the apostolic age? This was the very thing it did not, nor for three reasons could it afford to do: (i) In place of the immediate relation of God and the soul, it had to substitute a mediate relation, worked through its

* Heb. xi. 6. Cf. John xiv. 1; xvi. 9; xvii. 20–21.

† Rom. v. 1; iii. 28; Gal. ii. 16; iii. 11. ‡ Eph. ii. 8; Acts xvi. 31.

§ 1 John v. 1. || Acts xxvi. 18; John xvii. 17.

¶ Rom. i. 17; ix. 30; x. 3, 4; Phil. iii. 9.

** If one would know what religion is and how faith can make a man religious, one must study Heb. xi. The best commentary I know on this particular chapter has no special connection with it. It is contained in the De Civitate Libb., xv.–xviii. Cf. Rom. iii. 26–31; viii. 1–9; Gal. iii. 7–8, 24–26, 28–29.

organized polity, which promised to accomplish this through authorized mediators. Here, then, three positions are affirmed, any one of which will involve the repeal of Christianity as the primitive church knew it. (*α*) The apotheosis of the polity, which cannot be done without lessening the preeminence and power of Christ. (*β*) The mediator who cannot step into his position unless Christ steps out of His; and (*γ*) The mediator who must be "authorized," and, in order to his being, the community must be unified and made capable of speech. The unity must therefore be one of two sorts, either local, where the church is represented by the bishop, or universal, where the church is symbolized in the Pope. (ii) In order to the adequacy of either form the church must be believed to be in the possession of sacraments which it and those it authorizes are alone able to administer. And the Head must be able to speak and to act in the manner of a collective society — a condition fatal to the local idea. Hence the church had to substitute for the direct appeal of the truth to the reason, the word of authority; and the voice of God was muffled and muzzled by the voice of the church. (iii) The church had to affirm a justification by sacraments, and deny a justification by faith; and in so affirming it declared as its faith a grace that lives in and works through ritual which was but the elaborate impotence of man, not the spontaneous beneficence and power of God. The new polity was the repeal of the apostolic doctrine; and if the doctrine was necessary to the religion of Christ, the polity was fatal to it.

2. As to the ethics, it will be enough to note two points. (i) The first concerns a most remarkable quality of Christ's teaching, what may be termed its *inwardness*. The great matter was not what a man *did*, but what he *was*. The *doing* would be right were the *being* right. Alms

before men, prayers in the temple and at the street corners, phylacteries or pious formulæ of any kind, fasts, care for ceremonial purifications and practices — these and such-like were to Him no religious virtues, only masks and mockeries, "dead works" that usurped the place of living obedience to God and beneficent duties to man. His own ideal was — a man with light and life within, determined in all his actions by love, jealous of the ostentatious and ceremonial, suspicious of a goodness according to rule and custom, cultivating his spirit and doing his works in secret, perfect as God is perfect, full of all ethically holy activities, yet possessing and enjoying the sweet and sane and familiar humanities.

Now what are the temper and moral tendencies of an elaborately organized society at once sacerdotal and political? Exactly those which Christ most resisted, hated, suffered from — those which most seek to compel a uniform ceremonial or outward obedience, and which identify ritual and rules with right conduct, sensuous worship with living obedience. And what are the virtues which such ritual and rules must produce, cultivate, and praise? Precisely those that Christ held to be most unreal, the mimicry and counterfeit of the true and the good. This applies not simply to the kind of things that come to be esteemed virtuous, like penances and repetition of formulated and prescribed prayers; but also to virtues that seem more distinctly moral. Submission may, under certain conditions, be a very excellent quality; but if it be exaggerated it tends to become a positive vice. The man who makes a complete surrender of his conscience to his superior and regards himself as a simple vehicle or agent of his superior's will, ceases to be, in the true sense, a moral man; he renounces knowledge of the inward law Jesus so laboured to make articulate and obedience to the living God who speaks

in it. As Augustine said of fallen man, he so forsook God that God forsook him; for all evil is of man, as all good is of God; and evil has no ameliorative or redemptive power. Terence can teach us that even love has its vices and its pains: *Injuriæ, suspiciones, inimicitiæ, bellum, pax rursum.** And did not Tully say, that the open adversary could be resisted, while evil, which had made its home with man, could not? And did not Luther say, that what was contrary to the will was also contrary to the truth of God; for obedience has care, while submission had none? And absolute submission is the attitude not simply of the Jesuit to his superior, but of every man who places his soul in the hands of a spiritual director, to whom he makes confession, through whom he receives absolution, and in conformity to whose expressed will he undertakes to walk. The inwardness Christ required is not possible to him — the light is not inner, the life is not inner; the truth he knows does not "make him free" † and become within a "well of water springing up unto everlasting life," ‡ and his virtues are not such as become a kingdom which is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." §

(ii) The second point to be noted in the primitive and apostolical ethics is for our discussion even more significant; for it touches the very heart of the idea of religion and religious service. As Christ and the apostles spiritualized the idea of the priesthood, they spiritualized also the idea of sacrifice. These two, indeed, must always correspond. Where the priesthood is sensuous or carnal, sacrifice must be the same, and so if either becomes spiritual the other must be made spiritual as well. In harmony with this necessity the sacrifices of the New Testament are all ethical,

* *Eun.*, act i, sc. i, lines 14–16; *Apud de civitate*, xix. 5.
† John viii. 32. ‡ John iv. 14. § Rom. xiv. 17.

forms in which man expresses his obedience to God, or the complete surrender of himself and all he has to the Divine will. Men who present their bodies a "living sacrifice" offer what is "holy and acceptable unto God," perform what is in its nature a service of reason.* The sacrifices with which "God is well pleased" are beneficence and charity.† The "holy priesthood" are, indeed, expressly chosen "to offer up spiritual sacrifices."‡ "Praise" is a "sacrifice,"§ and the spontaneous gifts of love are "an odour of sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God."|| The most Jewish writer in the New Testament emphasizes these ideas in his definition of "pure religion and undefiled"; it knows neither sacerdotalism nor legalism, but is simply "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."¶

VI

1. Now if we turn from the New Testament to a writer still so intrinsically and essentially apostolical as Cyprian, the nature and bearing of the change worked by the sacerdotal idea becomes at once apparent. The spiritual idea which we have seen to be everywhere in the New Testament may be said to have vanished; the priesthood of the bishops has superseded the priesthood of believers, and the bread and wine of the supper, so far as the body and blood of Christ are identical with them, have become the true and only sacrifice. The supper is the *sacrificium dominicum*, instituted by Christ in His capacity of High Priest, offered by the bishop, as the vicarious priest, to God the Father, as Christ originally had been. The cele-

* Rom. xii. 1. † Heb. xiii. 16. ‡ 1 Peter ii. 5.
§ Heb. xiii. 15. || Phil. iv. 18. ¶ James i. 27.

bration of the supper is a *sacrificium Dei Patris et Christi*, the wine is *Vinum calicis dominici sanguinis*, and so he can say *passio est domini sacrificium, quod offerimus.** The revolution is as complete as it is disastrous; the apostolical idea is not only lost, but replaced by an idea that is its very contradiction. The primitive idea was full of splendid ethical meaning, and so of immense moral energy. It made obedience the only sacrifice which was possible to man and well pleasing to God. It made conduct the body of religion and its soul love to man. It thus bound faith and action, believing and living, the grace of God and the service of man in holy and indissoluble bonds. It made Christianity the most beneficent power which had ever entered the world, a religion which incorporated and transfigured morality, which universalized the higher and the gentler virtues, which made all the religious forces of life and thought moral forces and turned the most pious into the most virtuous and saintly man. But the sacerdotal revolution reversed all this, divorced sacrifice from the life, made it sensuous, a thing created by an institution, offered by an order, capable of all the abuses that made religion and morality not only distinct, but constant and inveterate foes. To the religion of Christ, Jesuit casuistry, which is only the applied morality of scientific sacerdotalism, is radically alien.

2. The sacerdotal polity even more completely changed and depraved the social ideal of Christ and His apostles. That ideal was a free spiritual brotherhood, where men lived in the spirit and walked by it. Clergy and

* Ep. lxiii. 4, 5, 6, 9, 17 (Ox. Ed.). This whole epistle, *Ad Cæcilium de Sacramento Domini Calicis*, is an extremely instructive study. It shows how completely the New Testament idea of Christian sacrifice had been metamorphosed, and with what subtle and fantastic ingenuity the history of the Old Testament could be used to foist doctrines into the New.

laity did not stand sharply opposed to each other, distinguished and divided by official, which are ever fictitious, sanctities; nay, clergy and laity did not even exist then. The most eminent distinctions were moral, the best gifts spiritual, and possible to all. The man who lived nearest to God stood highest among men; he who loved most lived the best. Office carried with it no special sanctity, sanctity only qualified for office. The supreme thing was the incorporation of the ethical ideal in a spiritual commonwealth, where the good of each was the aim and joy of all; and each had his place and function in the society determined by the gift which manifested the grace of God. Regarded as to its internal relations, it was a family, a brotherhood, a household of faith;* studied from the standpoint of its privileges and liberties, it was an ἐκκλησία, or society of the enfranchised, where every man was a free citizen;† conceived in its relation to God, it could be variously described, as a "kingdom," an "elect people," a "royal priesthood," or a "temple built of living stones."‡ The last aspects are signally significant; where the temple is spiritual, built of living stones, quickened and glorified by the indwelling God, the only sanctity possible is one of persons, not of place or rite, or act and symbol. When man in Christ became at once the temple and the priesthood, the ancient sensuous worship utterly ceased, and the only sacrifices acceptable to God were those of living obedience and holy will.

But the essential elements in this social ideal are precisely the elements cancelled and annihilated by the priestly idea in

* Eph. iii. 15; 1 Peter ii. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 9; Gal. vi. 10; Eph. ii. 19.

† 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. viii. 19.

‡ John xviii. 36–7; 1 Peter ii. 9; Titus ii. 14; Heb. viii. 10; 1 Peter ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6; 1 Cor. iii. 16–19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. iii. 21.

all its possible forms. It builds on the distinction between clergy and laity, and loves official sanctities as its very life. The priesthood becomes a sacred office, the priest a sacred person, and "laymen" belong to the world and are concerned with things profane. The clergy constitute the church; without them the highest worship is impossible, the society being unable to approach God without its priests. Sacred orders are fatal to brotherhood; distinct classes, not to say castes, forbid fraternity. And the duties they enforce are not ethical, but official and artificial. Place and function in the society are determined not by the gifts of the Spirit, but by the rules and agencies of the order. Sacerdotal office does not demand the highest spiritual manhood; priests are too easily made to require the noblest material for their making. The system that does not emphasize the need of the highest spiritual qualities in the man concerned with religion, is a bad religious system; and no official priesthood in any religion the world has known ever gave to ethics its proper and authoritative place. The evolution of sacerdotalism in the Christian Church was the death of all the distinctive social and moral elements in the religion of Christ.

It thus seems that the evolution of the organized sacerdotal polity at once superseded and suppressed the elements in Christianity that were most distinctively original, and so those most decisively emphasized by Christ and His apostles. And this is true alike of doctrine and precept, faith and conduct, political ideal and social realization. Can a state which realizes what was essential in Judaism and Hellenism be judged as just to Christ?

VI

HOW OUT OF AN ATTEMPT TO REVIVE THE RELIGION OF CHRIST SECTS HAVE COME

AT this point then we are to be concerned with what is known as the Reformation. It may be defined as an attempt to recover primitive Christianity, with its ideas and methods, its doctrines and duties, its truths and modes of behaviour. It was an attempt necessarily based on the Scriptures, especially those of the New Testament. These showed what the original had been, what Jesus had said and suffered, done and designed; what His apostles thought and taught, attempted and achieved. The minds of the Reformers might be thus expressed: "In order that it may do its work in the world, Christianity must again become the religion of Christ." But it was easier to see what was needed than to accomplish it. Much, of course, was gained by the mere revolt from the sacerdotal polity which had been organized into Catholicism. Its strength was broken; it might storm as of old, but its thunder had lost its power to terrify, and its lightning to smite.

I

1. Now, what rose in the revolted provinces was not the primitive ideal, but approximations to it. And these approximations were more or less remote. The Reformers,

like men everywhere, worked under the limitations of time and place; and they did not work alone, but through, and along with, and, in certain cases, under Kings and States. The Reformer that worked most through and least under a State accomplished his work most thoroughly; the Reformers that worked most completely under and for a sovereign accomplished the least. The scene of the most thorough reformation was Geneva, of the least complete, England; and the difference in mode showed itself in the difference in spirit. The result was that in Geneva the Reformed church had all the aggressive, zealous, strenuous spirit of primitive Christianity, but in England the church had almost none of it. There was more apostolic activity and purpose in Geneva than in any other city of the Reformation. And this is the more remarkable, that, as regards population, it was one of the smallest cities, yet in it there lived a splendid faith in the truth, in the right of the ideal to command the actual, in the formative as in the reformative force of religion, in its claim to be in all things the creative, constitutive, and normative principle. And small Geneva did marvellous things — sent its strong faith into France, into Holland, into remote Scotland, invaded even Lutheran Germany, and wherever it went it acted liked iron in the spiritual blood, raised up massive, heroic men, stoical in character, stern in temper, inflexible in will, unable to accept defeat, yet in victory ever conscious that God alone was victorious. But the Anglican church was thoroughly insular, without universal sympathies, lived and acted as a church for the English people alone, save where here and there touched by Genevan influences, accomplishing the work with as little change as possible, leaving as much of the venerable edifice the ages had built as the forces at work could be induced to spare. There was no

attempt at a return to the religion of Christ, only at the *re*-formation of the church of England.

And it was a church coextensive and, indeed, identical with the State. As Archbishop Whitgift* was never tired of saying, there was an extraordinary difference between the apostolic times and ours, especially in the church and the kind of government it implied and required; for in the apostles' day churches were so small that every one knew every other and kept on him a watchful eye; but now prosperous days have come to the church and the numbers which profess Christ are greatly increased. Then in no one kingdom, no one city, no one town, did the majority of its citizens profess Christ; now whole kingdoms, whole cities, whole towns profess Him. As a consequence "the church is full of hypocrites, dissemblers, drunkards, whoremongers," and such-like. And so the church is as the State is, and is "a field where the devil soweth tares as fast as the husbandman good corn." For "many are called, but few are chosen."†

2. The incompleteness of the work of the Reformation in England made the church an offence to many consciences. The English church seemed so mean and feeble compared with the church of Geneva,‡ and it had been throughout so regulated by the spirit of expediency and statecraft, that men of a sterner and more ideal faith were irresistibly impelled beyond it. The splendid success of the Genevan model filled many with admiration; they pleaded in its behalf with sovereign and people, and zealously worked for its adoption in England. The men who thus pleaded and

* *The Defence of the Answer to the Admonition*, Whitgift, Works (Parker Society), vol. i, pp. 375–395.

† Cf. Matt. xx. 16; xxii. 14.

‡ It had been said by no less an Englishman than Archdeacon Philpots to be "one and catholic and apostolic." — Work, p. 158.

worked were offended either at the corruptions, or at the church which they held to be mainly responsible for their existence. The first class were Puritans; the second became Separatists.

(i) What has here to be said as to the Puritans cannot be better introduced than in certain words of Whitgift: "This name Puritan is very aptly given to these men; not because they be pure, no more than were the heretics called Cathari; but because they think themselves *mundiores ceteris*, 'more pure than others,' as the Cathari did, and separate themselves from all other churches and congregations, as spotted and defiled; because also they suppose the church which they have devised to be without all impurity." * This is quoted not because approved, but because it excellently expresses the spirit of the time, which was always merciless, whether it used as its vehicle brutal, frank ferocity or cruel innuendo; and because it shows how little the affinity of the Puritan with the Anglican counted, and how his distinction from the Separatist was even then misunderstood.

Puritans like Cartwright did not differ from Anglicans like Whitgift so much in their notion of the church as a State, as in their idea of religion and the ministry.†

* *Ibid.*, p. 171. Whitgift's church history is incorrect, especially as regards his account of the Cathari. Nobody thinks of assailing them as he did. Neither in their case nor in the case of the Puritans was the claim made either in themselves or in their societies and churches to be "more pure than others." But the question was in no respect personal; it concerned simply the purpose of the gospel and its churches. As to the origin of the name in 1564, cf. Thomas Fuller's *Church History of Great Britain*, ix. § i, 66, 67. Fuller has a better sense for the origin and meaning of words than Whitgift. He says: "Such as refused the ceremonies and discipline were branded with the odious name of Puritans."

† Were we to speak of the Puritan in strictly modern terms, we should call him a churchman who believed in the religious functions of the State. He had no objection to the establishment as an establishment; for as "a nonconforming conformist" (see Gardiner, *History of England*, 1603–42,

The Puritan, therefore, differed from both the Anglican and the Separatist, while he also agreed with both. He differed from the Anglican by affirming, not the supremacy, but the sufficiency of the Scripture which set out the polity the church was to realize, the ministry it was to organize and sanction, how it was to be maintained, what the ministers were to wear, and what to teach as well as preach. (ii) But where he agreed with the Anglican he differed from the Separatist; for he held the legitimacy of none but a State church or a church founded and endowed and ruled by the chief magistrate. He agreed with the Separatist, therefore, not in his doctrine of Scripture, which was much freer than the Anglican, so much as in the idea of religion

vol. iii, p. 241, where he speaks of "Puritan conformists," and says that the phrase is used to denote the people who "appear in ecclesiastical histories as 'Doctrinal Puritans'") he was willing to stand within it and to work through it, which the Separatist was neither willing nor attempted to do. Gardiner has not properly described the Puritan or what he stood for; the name is, he says, "a constant source of trouble to the historian" (iii. 241), as if the historian could be either accurate or a maker of literature without trouble. If we are right in our description no Puritan as such ever stood outside the establishment. He was indeed less a Calvinist in theology than a Calvinist in ethics, who, as Gardiner says, "because he looked upon the world as the kingdom of God," saw in vision an ideal England, sober, temperate, and chaste, "without the riotous festivities of Whitehall, and the drunken revelries of the village alehouse" (iii. 242). He hated, therefore, moral corruption and feared its evil effects. As a man with a moral nature, he, unlike Whitgift, disliked the immoral latitude of the Elizabethan State-church, which, with his antecedents, especially those he owed to Geneva and Calvin, he could not but do (see *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii, 364–8). It was an act of pure impertinent irrelevance or of ignorance and consistent lying on the part of Richard Montagu to charge the authors of the Lambeth Articles with being Puritans. Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln, named Whitgift, who certainly was an author of the Lambeth Articles, the "blessed Archbishop"; though he, like Calvin himself and Richard Hooker, was an Augustinian in theology, yet he had too little moral squeamishness to be either a Puritan or shocked at the corruptions of the time, whether in church or State. Therefore, we feel that the charge against him and Hooker was enough to make both men turn in their graves, for neither thought, as Sanderson says, "so much as by dream," that the charge was true or possible.

and of the religious institution, which were to both essentially ethical, and also as to its being the duty of the civil magistrate, as both Barrowe and Greenwood said, — thus lapsing from Independency, whether historical or contemporary, — to "compel all to hear God's Word"; where the Puritan differed from the Separatist was as regards the power of the civil magistrate "to compel any person to be a member of the church," which involved not only the principle of conversion as a personal change; but also the idea that it did not lie within the province or the power of the civil magistrate to exercise compulsion in religion. The point of disagreement was fundamental. The Puritan was bound, therefore, to follow one of two lines: either to develop his idea of religion till it became logically complete, when the church merged in the State and the religious person in England became simply the English citizen; or to develop the idea of religious morality till it became an idea regulative of the church as an institution. If the one line was taken he became a pronounced and aggressive State churchman; but if he followed the other line he became a dissenter and an exponent of primitive Christianity as he understood the New Testament, especially as regards its doctrine of religion and the church. This is the natural history of Puritanism, and explains both its emergence and its disappearance. It may be said to have lasted from 1570 — though, according to Thomas Fuller, 1564 is more correct, yet the first edition of the *Admonition to Parliament* was published as late as 1571 — till 1660 and 1662, the years, respectively, of the Restoration and the Act of Uniformity. With Charles the Second's return and the reëstablishment of the State on a regal basis, Puritanism ceased to be, and was either absorbed into legal uniformity or became Presby-

terian. What England knew under that name is a system which has leaned more to the national than to the individual profession of religion.

Now the political questions which agitated the minds of men in the church were the same as in the State: What is the "tenure" of kings and magistrates, archbishops, bishops, and deans? Do they rule and legislate by hereditary right, or as representatives? If as the last, whom do they represent? Christ, the King, and His Apostles? Or the people? If Christ and His Apostles, then they ought to be as He and they are not; but if the people, then law comes in, and it follows that the higher the representative the more is he bound by the law which created him. The Puritan like Whitgift assumed two fundamental positions: (i) that every church was national, and that to show any church to be a mere denomination was to prove it false; and (ii) that every person who belonged to a kingdom, a city, a town, or a parish, belonged to its church, and the church, like the State, had to legislate for the citizens as a whole. Where Puritan and Anglican differed was on three points: (*α*) as regards the Scriptures, which Cartwright held to formulate the only true polity to which all churches ought to conform. Hence he said, "We must have a right ministry of God, and a right government of His church, according to the Scriptures set up; or else there can be no right religion, nor yet for contempt thereof can God's plagues be from us any while deferred." And again, "Nothing should be placed in the church, save that God hath in His word commanded," though Cartwright made a remarkable and strong distinction between "placed in the church by the command of God" and tolerated in the church. (*β*) As regards the ministry of the church, which Cartwright said ought to be a presbytery, where all were equal, not a priest-

hood, which implied the inequality both inner and outer of each member; and therefore the inequity of the author of nature, who wrote two inconsistent laws, the one on the fleshy tables of the heart, the other in His Word. And so (α) and (β) coalesced. (γ) As regards its responsibility for the moral integrity of every person within it. What shocked the Puritan was the corruption connived at; and what he sought was to make the church an engine for the reformation of morals and manners. Hence we read in the *Admonition:* "Seeing that nothing in this mortal life is more diligently to be sought for, and carefully to be looked unto, than the restitution of true religion and reformation of God's church, it shall be your parts, dearly beloved, in this present parliament assembled, as much as in you lieth to promote the same, and to employ your whole labour and study, not only in abandoning all popish remnants both in ceremonies and regiment, but also in bringing in and placing in God's church those things only which the Lord Himself in His word commandeth; because it is not enough to take pains in taking away evil, but also to be occupied in placing good in the stead thereof."

II

1. Where the Separatist differed from the Puritan, therefore, was not in the objection to an incomplete reform of morals, but in his idea of the cause of immorality, which he held to be the church as a church. Men must proceed not by admonitions or appeals to Parliament but to the People; men must be revered as men. Hence it became evident to the Separatist that Geneva had gone to work in the wrong way, had alike in its ideal and its method gone beyond the New to the Old

Testament. Its aim had been to realize a Mosaic rather than a Christian State, to fulfil the dream of David more than of Paul, to institute a θεοκρατία rather than an ἐκκλησία or an assembly of free and enfranchised Christian men. The new ideal was a return to the religion of Christ, to the method and aims of His apostles. The primitive simplicity was held to be the secret of primitive power; to depend on the civil magistrate, to work by his arm and through his agents, meant to be commanded by his expediencies rather than by Christ's mind and truth. The kingdom of God was a kingdom of the godly; the Church of Christ was a society of Christian men. It must be enlarged and maintained in His way, not in the way of Queen Elizabeth or James the First. The Church of Christ in England could not be a creation of the sovereign of England, to be changed and arranged as a much marrying Henry or a fanatical Mary might determine. It was Christ's, and His way must be followed if His ideal was to be realized. And what was His way? He did not ask Herod, who was quite as respectable a person as Henry, to help Him. He did not implore the consent and aid of the chief priests, who were in their own place and day quite as potent and capable persons as the Anglican bishops. He did not appeal for counsel and coöperation to Pilate, who, measured by his age and people, was at any rate the equal of Thomas Cromwell. But He created His Church by the words which expressed His ideal. He preached His truth on the hill-side, or the Galilean lake, or by its shore, to the publican sitting at the receipt of custom or looking down from the sycamore tree, to the few who met in the home of women who loved much, to the crowds that gathered round Him in the way, or in the temple, or in the chief places of concourse; and out of the men who heard, believed, and obeyed, His kingdom

was constituted, His church formed. None but those who were "of the truth" still heard His voice. To use the agencies and instruments of imperial Rome or of sacerdotal Judea would have made His kingdom a "kingdom of this world" rather than of heaven. And as with Him, so with His apostles; they were preachers, who created churches by the word of the Cross and out of men who believed. Peter might be condemned by the great council to silence; but he declared that he must "obey God rather than men," and could not "but speak the things which he had heard." * Paul might reason with Felix; but it was of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," † not about the most fitting way of establishing churches.

And, it was argued then, as now, the only true Christianity is Christ's; the only right method the method followed by Him and His apostles. Restore the truth and way of the New Testament and the glory of the apostolic age will return.

2. This roughly and dimly, but truly, represents the mind of the early Congregationalists.‡ Their aim was to realize

* Acts iv. 19–20.

† Acts xxiv. 25.

‡ The term "Congregationalists" is here used advisedly and in contrast to "Independents." Between the names there is a quite perceptible historical distinction. It is not only that Americans like the late Dr. Dexter prefer "Congregational" to "Independent," while the English historian prefers "Independent" to "Congregational"; nor that according to a recent note the words differ, "Congregational" referring more to the sort of persons grouped in the church, "Independent" to the polity under which they are grouped, the constitution which makes the church free and sets it in contrast to the State. "Congregational" as a term rose at a time when "church" as a term was under a ban; and "congregation" denoted the local church as community rather than building. "Independent" rose at a time when the hand of the State lay heavy upon "the tender conscience," and freedom to profess religion was craved by religious men. Hence the American, who is free-born and has the love of freedom in his blood, thinks of the society and loves the term "Congre-

the ideal of the apostolic age, to follow Christ's way in order that they might reach His religion. It is a great mistake to imagine that their notion was exhausted in the thesis — the apostolic polity is the authoritative and normative polity for all time. Their contention really was: — We cannot get at the apostolic religion without going back to the apostolic polity; it must be restored if the religion which Christ instituted and His apostles preached is to be attained. In their idea of the Church there were four determinative elements. A church is (α) a society of the godly, or of men who truly believe and piously live. (β) It is a society instituted expressly to realize in the personal and collective life the religious ideals of Christ. (γ) It is capable of extension only by means that produce faith, and of development only by agencies that create godliness. (δ) It is autonomous and authoritative, possessed of the freedom necessary to the fulfilment of its mission, the realization of its ideals; and it is endowed with all the legislative and administrative powers needed for the maintenance of order and the attainment of progress. In their idea of religion, with such changes of form and emphasis as the differences made necessary, the same four elements reappeared. Godliness was a matter for the individual conscience; its realization was the most general and the most imperative of duties; its extension was the common obligation of the godly alone; and its sovereignty over every godly man and society was absolute and supreme. These ideas were all organically

gational"; and the Englishman, who admires those who struggled in the past for the freedom he enjoys in the present, thinks of the polity and loves the term "Independent." The "Congregationalists" were first, and the "Independents" rose in history later, about the time of the Westminster Assembly. For the distinction between "Congregational" and "Independent," see the late Dr. R. W. Dale, *History of English Congregationalism*, pp. 374–76; and Dexter's *Congregationalism as seen in its Literature*, pp. 49, 114, 523, 631–34, 656–60, 672–73.

connected; they represented no sectional nostrums, but a complete ideal of man, society and religion, of the way and the end of Christ. In these ideas Robert Browne,* Henry

* (A) Robert Browne was a member of a well-known family in Rutlandshire, near of kin, as Cecil himself confessed, to the Lord Treasurer. He had taken his degree at Cambridge about 1570, and for almost ten years he led a broken and rather wandering life. He became a ducal chaplain, a schoolmaster, a preacher in various churches, and finally he studied theology under Richard Greenham, Rector of Dey Drayton, where he, according to Neal, was suspended and silenced by Cox of the Frankfort troubles, then Bishop of Ely. The vicarage was near Cambridge, where Dr. Still, Master of Trinity, heard Browne preach, and predicted disturbance to the church. From Greenham he learned some valuable lessons; (α) that in the eyes of God sin was more odious than ridiculous; (β) the poor were, in spite of their poverty, the brothers of the rich; (γ) that a roof must be built as well as foundations laid, since both were equally necessary; (δ) that for a man to be driven into the ministry by hunger was good neither for the man nor the ministry nor the church he endeavoured to serve; (ϵ) that an evil minister is a devil's tool, for "the fountain is poisoned, and a poisoned fountain means that all who drink at it die. Such ministers are like bells calling out to others places where they never themselves come; like to black soap which made white, while it remained black; like to blunt whetstones, which sharpen other things, while continuing dull; like to rough ragged files, which smoothed other things, but remained rough themselves; like to Noah's shipwrights, which made the ark, but themselves were not saved in it (*Works of Richard Greenham*, p. 400). In a ministry like the Anglican, which was blind and dumb, young men might enter in haste, and know neither "staidness and moderation, nor experience and gravity in ordering affections" (*Ibid.*, p. 24; see also p. 519). (ζ) He was marked by equal zeal, (i) against non-residence, a flagrant and clamant evil, and (ii) in favour of an almost Puritan strictness of conduct, which tempted Thomas Fuller to say, "His sermons were lived before they were preached" (ix, § vii. 64–69). (η) He was also distinguished by zeal, (i) for the rest and quiet of the Sabbath, and (ii) against ecclesiastic polity which men were apt to over-estimate the importance of; for they tended to know many things rather than themselves. Browne, then, was under a good master; and over and above he had in him the preacher's passion, by which he felt, as John Wesley did, that "the whole world was his parish"; and this induced him not only to preach against subjection to bishops, but also to decline for himself an episcopal license. Once Browne's years of apprenticeship and wandering were concluded, he became a minister to independent churches, successively, at Norwich and Middelburg, in Holland, whence he passed into England by way of Scotland. In those years, about six, he made some discoveries, and by putting them into writing, he gave his name to a system. He had not stood still. Experience had

Barrowe, John Greenwood,† John Penry,‡ together with

taught him. Cartwright, as became a Puritan, stood by the principle of establishment, which Browne relinquished, holding that reformation should be, as he phrased it, "by persons rather than by parishes." In his famous treatise, published 1582, *Reformation without tarrying for anie*, he speaks strongly about the wickedness of those preachers who did not so preach as to convert men, but waited till the magistrate compelled them to attend the parish church. This remarkable treatise, though written by a man who himself conformed, was, therefore, a piece of early non-conformist literature. He expressed the idea that the church was simply a "gathered company of Christian men," who had willingly placed themselves under the government of God, and had promised to keep His law. There is in the Lambeth Library, bound up with an old copy of the treatise on "Reformation," a work which bears the title of *A Book which showeth the Life and Manners of all true Christians, and how unlike they are to Turks and Papists and Heathen folk*. This work defines the church, as well as some positions which Browne had strongly emphasised:—(i) the church is a body of men under the government of God; (ii) this ideal determines a second, which is concerned with the government of the church. This cannot be of any human lordship or any manlike sovereignty, since the church is composed of Christians or converted men; (iii) the people constitute a kingdom; (iv) a pastor is said to be a person who has office of God for which he is fit; (v) similarly a teacher is a person who has a message direct from God; and (vi) an elder is defined as a person who has office of oversight and counsel. Hence under the idea of the church an idea of religion is subsumed. (α) The civil ruler or sovereign, in his capacity as magistrate, has no ecclesiastical authority. He cannot compel a soldier to be a minister, or a preacher to give over his calling and exchange it for another. If he does, it is the bounden duty of men to disobey him. (β) The sovereign has his limits; as regards things of this world men must revere and obey him, but as regards things divine no magistrate as such can set himself above God. But (γ) the theory, as a whole, involved more than a limitation of power on the part of the civil magistrate, because magistrates who were against the church were also against religion. The conception thus involved the inter-relation of religion and the church; as was the one so was the other. Hence both had to be qualified as Christian; the church was composed only of men who embodied the Christian religion. And so (δ) there followed from the limitation of the ecclesiastical authority of the civil magistrate toleration in religion. Both were rigorously maintained; the authority of the magistrate in his own province was supreme, but toleration was based on the reality of religion and the rationality of man.

(B) Brownism and Brownist were popular names for the system Robert Browne advocated. It stood opposed (i) to Puritanism. In 1582, according to Thomas Fuller, Browne addressed a letter to Walter Travers, wherein he claimed Cartwright as agreeing in general with the Genevan theory that the Genevan state is co-extensive with the Genevan

Francis Johnson,§ Henry Ainsworth, John Robinson, and

Church. It forms, therefore, an admirable point from which our discussion as to Brownism may start. There was expressed in the letter what Fuller terms " the secret sympathy between England and Geneva " ; and he gives us as the reason why no English bishop had any sympathy with Geneva, that the exiles of the Marian days were all dead, and a generation had arisen which had neither affection for the Genevan government nor obligation to it. Brownism seemed to him to confound things so different and distinguishable as discipline and law, though as controversy then was, that did not matter. Discipline was Christian and stood related to disciple ; law was natural, and Mosaic. Discipline as Christian belonged to the church, and was very partially represented by excommunication as by other disciplinary acts ; while law was as old as nature and co-extensive with the race. We may say, then, (ii) that Brownism, as distinguished from Puritanism, laid stress on religion as something natural to man. And Whitgift, when he said that he knew no difference between a Christian Commonwealth and a Christian church, confessed the faith of Puritanism and Cartwright. Here we reach the fundamental point of controversy between Browne and Cartwright. Brown recognized that a man was proved to be a Christian by his virtues ; and he held that without conversion there could be no Christian man. Cartwright and Travers, who were, as Fuller said, both " eloquent kenners," and whom he respectively named the " head " and the " neck " of what he termed the " presbyterian party," which was his name for the Puritanism which held that a man was made Christian by the atmosphere in which he lived and the action of the whole on him, as distinguished from Browne's theory which said, the action of the individual upon the whole is primary. But (iii) while Cartwright and Travers agreed with Whitgift that there were advantages in a national profession of the Christian religion and so in a national establishment, Brownism stood distinguished from both Puritan and Anglican by holding individualism as a fixed first principle, and therefore the duty of beginning with the individual and ending with the society. And this seemed to him an advantage which accrued to church and to religion alike from freedom. What was called Brownism was, indeed, specially offensive to the men of the time ; and they were men who spoke their mind with extraordinary plainness and directness, yet we must protest against the endurance of injustice. And the injustice is twofold : (α) it is general, and consists mainly in regarding the Puritan as a dissenter, which he is not, and the source of modern dissent, which he is known not to be. But (β) it is also particular, and consists in what may be termed a misconception of Brownism, which may be seen if one turns to the " General Index " of the Parker Society Publications. There is nothing less true than that Brownism regarded any church member as a private person, or a church as a private association ; the one was a minister, the other a custodian of truth, which was a public possession because the property of all men.

Henry Jacob, who were early Congregationalists, agreed.

† Barrowe and Greenwood are names indissolubly associated. Henry Barrowe matriculated at Cambridge, 1566, where he studied law, migrating thence to London, where he became a member of Gray's Inn, and lived a loose life. While hearing a sermon, he made what Bacon calls "a leap from a vain and libertine youth to preciseness" (*Observations on a Libel*, Works, Bohn's Ed., i, 383). Whether there were, as Bacon testifies, "a kind of gospellers called Brownists," "a very small number of very silly and base people," is a question that need not be here discussed; but we know that Barrowe—though "a gentleman of a good house" and the senior of Greenwood, who had also been at Cambridge, where he matriculated about 1577, and graduated 1580, and was by ten years younger than Barrowe, yet older than he, for he had deepened his interest in religion—unlike Greenwood, was never ordained or in any other respect made a minister of the church. He went to visit Greenwood, who was in prison before him, but was detained and sent to Whitgift at Lambeth, where he had to contend on grounds of legality against his detention. The two men were early Independents, who had both separated from the church, though mainly on the ground of its connection with the state. They distinguished between the "parish assemblies" and the "true established churches of Christ." While they held that "many precious and elect vessels were to be found in every parish, yet it became them not to judge in God's stead and name." While they conceded that "the Queen as the supreme governor of the whole land had authority over the bodies and the goods of the church," they did not think "any prince could make laws for it other than Christ Himself had done." Barrowe has left a graphic account of what he suffered at the hands of Archbishop Whitgift and Bishop Aylmer of London. When asked whether he could come to church, he declined, specifying the reasons that made him a separatist: (i) "because the profane and wicked of the land are received into it"; (ii) "a false and anti-christian ministry were set over it"; (iii) "God was not rightly worshipped in it"; (iv) "the church was not governed by the testament of Christ, but by Roman canons." He was twitted with being the author of a new religion, a dignity he declined. He said that "Scripture" abused became "an idol"; and he regretted that "the sword of the Queen should be drawn against her faithful subjects." Turning upon Whitgift, he charged him with being "a monster, a miserable compound," "neither ecclesiastical nor civil," like to "the second beast spoken of in the Revelation" (xiii, 11–14). Greenwood was dealt with as Barrowe had been. "Did he hold it lawful to baptize children?" "Thank God, I am no Anabaptist." Charged with having a son unbaptized, he replied, "his son had not been baptized because he had been in prison." He did not hold a parish to be equal to a church, because he said the only condition on which he could recognize a parish as a church was that "all the people who dwell in it were faithful to God"; a man being made not by where he lived, but by what he was. When asked whether the Queen was "the supreme head of the church, over all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil," Greenwood made reply, "she was the

They believed that every society of godly men gathered supreme magistrate over all persons, to punish the evil and defend the good." "Did she then equally stand over all causes?" and he replied: "No; the church has only one Head, and His laws may no man alter." The two men combined to send a joint letter to Cartwright, protesting on grounds of New Testament theory, against the aristocracy of Calvin at Geneva. Their idea was that of a church as "a company of faithful people, bound to come out of all wickedness and to live in holy obedience." Those who composed the Church of England were neither faithful nor holy, and they, therefore, declined to hold communion with it. Its parish assemblies were too largely made up of "unclean spirits, atheists, papists, and heretics." Hence the parish assemblies "deny the right of Christ to reign over them." "The sovereign if he will be held a member of Christ must be subject to His censure in the church." After a plea for a disputation, they were executed in 1593.

‡ John Penry was younger than either Barrowe or Greenwood. He had been born just when Elizabeth came to the throne, and was said to be by birth and nurture a Roman Catholic. He must have surrendered his ancestral faith before coming to Cambridge, where he matriculated 1580, just as Greenwood was taking his degree. He was suspected of being the author and printer of the once famous Mar-Prelate Tracts. He had issued an appeal to the Queen to evangelize Wales, where the gentlemen and people would support the preachers as men who would bring them good. While Penry desired the conversion of Wales, he was not prepared to put under a ban his idea of religion. Hence he said that "in all likelihood had Queen Mary lived, the Church of England had been the Church of Rome"; and he also asked, "What good the church of God hath taken at the Queen's hands?" and answered, "It hath got outer peace, but hath got it with the absence of Christ Jesus and His ordinance." Penry was charged with "separating from the society of the Church of England to join with the hypocritical and schismatic conventicles of Barrowe and Greenwood." His interest was more in the people of Wales than in the English church. He is a beautiful character, who suffered much as a Welsh patriot; as he himself said, he was "a poor young man, born and bred in the mountains of Wales." In his dying speech he said: "If my blood were an ocean sea, and every drop thereof were a life unto me, I would give them all, by the help of the Lord, for the maintenance of the same my confession. And if my death can procure any quietness unto the church of God, and unto the State of my Prince and her kingdom wherein I was born, glad I am that I had a life to bestow in this service."

When he was dead, an admirer of the system he opposed was inspired to break into these doggerel lines:—

"The Welshman is hanged,
Who at our kirk flanged,
And at her state banged.
And burned are his books.
And though he be hanged;
Yet he is not wranged,
The devil has him fanged,
In his crooked kluks."

together in order to worship God in Christ was a church. They believed that every church was gathered out of a mixed society and organized itself according to the principles of Christ, pervaded by His spirit, living entirely for His ends. They believed that the kingdom of God was to come,

§ (α) Francis Johnson, who was the brother of George Johnson, married a wife who was the cause of a great deal of trouble to himself and to the church at Amsterdam. He was pastor of it, the man who presided over all its functions of worship, and was responsible to the people as a people of God for what he did and said.

(β) Henry Ainsworth is said to have been a Lancashire man, born near Blackburn, and educated in the school there. He was teacher in the church at Amsterdam over which Francis Johnson presided. Ainsworth was at once teacher of dogma and history, in Hebrew and in Greek, in the exposition of the Old and of the New Testament. He differed with Johnson on three occasions, the last of which was final and fatal to Johnson, who therefore may be said to have been less wise than Ainsworth, who had a subject which lent itself more to popular notions, without in any degree being less personal to men than the affairs of the time.

(γ) John Robinson is the famous Pilgrim pastor. He is known as Robinson of Leyden, partly because he went from England to Leyden and settled there, and hence the men of the *Mayflower* sailed from Delft Haven. He is known as a semi-separatist, i.e. as a person who agreed with the Puritans as to the corruption of the time, but who differed from his own friends as to the church being the main cause of the corruptions. So far, then, he may seem less vigorous and less modern than Barrowe and Greenwood; but he had the spirit native to the Congregational churches of New England. In this respect two things are significant: (i) his saying that God had more light to break out of His Holy Word, which signified that while they knew and had attained some knowledge, yet they did not know and had not attained to its fulness; (ii) he also said that while they had gone to New England to spread the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of England at the same time, they had far better and more wisely have proceeded in the way of converting one Indian before killing many.

(δ) Henry Jacob was the pastor of the first Congregational Church in England, the church, too, that created the word "independent" as an English word. Jacob had gone to Leyden and conferred with Robinson, who may, therefore, be regarded as the head not only of Congregationalism in America, but of Independency in England.

One of the informers in the pay of the Government testifies of the Independents that, "in all their meetings they teach that there is no Head or Supreme Governor of the church of God but Christ, and that the magistrate hath no authority to appoint ministers in the church,

not by the action of the magistrate or the political inclusion of whole parishes; but by the pure preaching of the Word and the godly living of the faithful. They believed that societies so created and constituted were independent; only as they were so could they obey the conscience God illumined, or build up a society after the ideal of Christ; and so over them in matters religious neither bishop nor presbytery nor magistrate could have any authority to exercise coercion or control.

3. Now it would be interesting to compare this independent polity, even in its first crude conception, with the Anglican and Genevan polities. Here, for example, is Hooker's fine statement of his idea:

"We hold that, seeing there is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth, nor any member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England, therefore as in a figure triangle the base doth differ from the sides thereof, and yet one and the selfsame line is both a base and also a side, a side simply, a base if it chance to be the bottom and underlie the rest: so, albeit proportions and actions of one do cause the name of a Commonwealth, qualities and functions of another sort the name of the Church, to be given to a multitude, yet one and the self-

nor to set down any government for the church which is not directly commanded in God's Word." In an early confession there is given not simply a definition of the catholic or universal church, but of the local, the church to which Christ's promises were made; and as all men who belonged to this church were Christian, it was held to combine with the idea the promises of the Lord to His people as well. The church catholic is thus defined: "This church as it is universally understood, containeth in it all the elect of God that have been, are, or shall be." The church local is again defined as "consisting of a company and fellowship of faithful and holy people gathered in the name of Christ Jesus, their only King, Priest, and Prophet, worshipping him aright, being peaceably and quietly governed by his officers and laws, keeping the unity of faith in the bond of peace and love unfeigned."

same multitude may in such sort be both, and is so with us, that no person appertaining to the one can be denied also of the other." *

How comprehensive and large-minded this seems! What a splendid idea of a church — immense, complex, varied, rich with a nation's resources, and strong in the strength of its massive and masterly genius, especially when placed alongside the mean and ignoble "company of believers," or "covenanted society of the faithful," which was all the despised Brownists had to offer in its place! But fill out the two ideas, and then let us see which is the sublimer. Were the Church but a State, were it laden with no universal and eternal truths richer and diviner than the thoughts of any people; did it bear no transcendental ideas and ambitions of a range so infinite as to shame into insignificance the aims and aspirations of the most exalted nations; did it care no more for character than the State cares; were its honours reserved for capacity and favour rather than saintliness — then Hooker's idea might be as noble as the Congregational ideal seems poor and mean. Here, then, we have four things: (i) The significance of historical continuity, which is the continuous history of a people. (ii) The completeness of the abolition of the distinction between church and State. (iii) The abolition is so complete that it refers to every citizen who becomes *de facto et de jure* a "member of the church of England." (iv) The difference between the two is purely one of nomenclature. The entity called the State may differ from the entity called the church, but the difference is as that between a base and a side in a triangle; each is simply "a self-same line."

* *Ecclesiastical Polity*, vol. ii, p. 382. (Ed. 1825.) Bk. viii, ch. i, § 2. (Ed. 1888.)

But the church of England is infinitely more than even the Commonwealth of England. To Hooker the English church was but a political system, like the Commonwealth of England, into which the English race had been formed or organized. But Hooker, like the schoolman he was, answering his own question, "By what accident a society is termed a church?" says, "When we oppose the church and the Commonwealth in the Christian society, we mean by the Commonwealth that society with relation to all the public affairs thereof, only the matter of true religion excepted; by the church *the same society*, with only reference to the matter of true religion." And so he adds, "We name a society a Commonwealth in regard of some regiment or policy under which men live; a church for the truth of that religion which they profess."* But the fundamental points in his distinction he forgot in his discussion. To profess "the truth of a religion" is a personal act, which must be voluntarily and consciously done to be done at all; but this was precisely what could not happen or be allowed to happen in Hooker's theory of the identity of church and State. To him "one society is both the Church and Commonwealth," † and, as a necessary result, "our Church hath dependence from the chief in our Commonwealth." But this was to transform the profession of religion into a matter of loyalty, and to identify Nonconformity with rebellion. Responsibility to the king supplanted responsibility to God, godliness became a species of political obedience, and the church was emptied of its transcendental and ethical ideals that it might be organized into a system which was all the more civil that it was so intensely sacerdotal.

* *Ibid.*, p. 386. † *Ibid.*, p. 389.

But now let us turn to the idea that looks so mean beside Hooker's majestic conception. The Congregationalists said, A church is "a company of believers," a "covenanted society of the godly." But what did this signify? Did it not articulate a conception of God, of His methods and ends, of the dignity of man, of an unrealized but realizable spiritual order, far sublimer than was expressed in Hooker's ecclesiastical ideal? The systems must be judged not by their immediate and sensible attributes, but by their inherent principles, essential tendencies, and ultimate results. The Anglican emphasized the idea of the church, its unity, authority, order; but the Congregationalist emphasized the idea of religion, the personal relation of God to the soul and the soul to God, aimed at making it feel in every moment and for every act directly responsible to Him; embosomed in the infinite, a child of the eternal, able to use all sensuous things, even such as were sacred, as means of discipline or instruments of godliness, but never as necessities for the spirit. The Anglican dwelt fondly on the notion of political uniformity and a political obedience, a uniform law in church as in State, with its graded orders and regulated ministries, each created and sanctioned by acts political while ecclesiastical; but the Congregationalist loved the dream of spiritual unity and moral obedience, held enforced uniformity to be the mother of hypocrisy and all unrealities, fiercely hated the ecclesiastical conformity that too often allowed, and even rewarded, a faith without godliness, strenuously disbelieved in the sanctity of sensuous forms in religion, and orders created or dignities conferred by ordination, and as strenuously believed in the sanctity of saintliness and the priesthood of universal Christian man. The Anglican made obedience to the church a question for the magistrate, bound the sovereign and the church in relations that

placed the sovereign above its discipline and placed the church under his authority; but the Congregationalist made obedience to God the distinctive characteristic of the religious, the church independent of the magistrate, the sovereign able to exercise no authority over it, with no standing in it as a prince, only as a man, as such amenable to it for his conduct, liable, like other men, to censure for ungodliness, or to honour if he did well. The ideals were opposites, but Congregationalism had throughout incomparably the nobler, where understood, appealing most mightily at once to the conscience and imagination of man. It seized with unexampled force the ethical significance of religion, bound godliness to faith, and made conformity to the Divine will the supreme condition of continuance in the church. It held in the loftiest scorn the systems that magnified office, that revered dignities rather than character, that enforced church discipline as if it were a matter of civil law, and was more jealous of the order of the magistrate than the honour of God. And with all the blended energy and patience of large conviction, Congregationalism laboured in obscurity and amid reproach to make religion the concern of the religious, to persuade the godly to live unto God and for man, to form themselves into brotherhoods, to live in amity towards each other, in fidelity to the State, and in righteousness towards all men. And Congregationalists so believed as to live in the hope that thus the kingdom of God would most surely come, and His will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

III

But now how did this Congregational polity, especially when it became Independent, affect the religion of Christ and the attempt at its realization? In order to answer

this question we must exhibit the polity, not only in itself, but also as it interpreted and represented religion alike to man and society, or to the individual and the State. Our space permits us to notice only a few salient points.

1. The first thing to be noticed is this, the polity was the complete negation of what we have called sacerdotalism, with its political and religious bases. It signified the affirmation that religion was altogether spiritual, and real only as it was realized in the spirit and in the truth.* The priesthood of all believers is the only priesthood Independency knows; † its only sacrifices are those of spiritual service. ‡ It will allow no official person to stand between the soul and God; they two must meet each other face to face. The man who leads it is the teacher and preacher, not the priest but the prophet, able to exercise his office only by right of a Divine vocation, with no right to it unless the call be manifestly of God. His function is so to speak the truth in love as to speak it in power, so to preach as to save souls, so to teach as to enlighten and sanctify saints. Faith is the first thing demanded from every man; on personal conviction alone can a real religious experience be built. Doctrine is thus restored to its rightful place, and made the vital centre of the whole system. The religion of Christ lived at first not as a political organization, but by the truths that persuaded the intellect and commanded the conscience. It created a new life because it gave new convictions; it renewed the man by the renewal of his whole intellectual and spiritual world. And the distinctive note of Independency was its direct appeal to the conscience and reason, its presentation of religion as

* John iv. 23–24.
† 1 Peter ii. 5–9; Rev. i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6.
‡ Rom. xii. 1; Phil. iv. 18.

the truth or series of truths that should reconcile man with God and with His order, and enable him to live in obedience to the eternal law of righteousness. The first and supreme thing was this reconciliation with God. Man could never be right in his human relations so long as he was wrong in his Divine. He could never hold his proper place in society, or fulfil his highest duties, until he lived in harmony with the order God had instituted. The passion for the church as a political organization was to Independency a mean ambition; its passion was for the kingdom of God and for the souls of men, for the obedience worked through faith in the truth and realized in righteousness.

Hence its personal ideals in religion were ethical as well as intellectual. It believed in the ethics of Jesus, in His sermon on the mount as an obligatory law, designed for obedience and capable of being obeyed; it loved His light, struggled after His sweetness, and endeavoured to find and walk in the way of His truth. It believed in the apostolic politics, held the brotherhood of believers to be a fact that ought to lie at the basis and regulate the relations and actions of all the living units built into the society called a church. It thought that the saintliest must also be the sanest man, the most reasonable and honourable; it trusted in the promise of an indwelling Spirit, possessed by each, distributed through all, making even the lowliest company of the godly a goodly "fellowship of saints." And the Independents loved even unto death the polity which enabled them to live and struggle for their ideal; for without it they did not see how their religion could ever be the religion of Christ.

2. But a no less important point was the way in which Independency interpreted and represented religion to Society and the State. It may be said to have introduced a new

conception of the relation of religion to the magistrate. Religion, I say, which it emphasized, not the church, which it did not. It was a denial of the magistrate's authority over religion, combined with an assertion of its authority over him. These stood indissolubly together, and were but the negative and positive aspects of the same idea. Religion was too divine a thing to be used by any mere political person for political purposes, to be ordered and administered in the methods and for the ends of the mere statesman. God was an authority so absolute and universal as to require equal obedience in all persons and estates; He was incapable of accepting any homage other than godliness. Over against the Anglican idea of conformity to a mere ecclesiastical institution, Independency placed the idea of conformity to the will of Deity, with all that it implied as to the supremacy of conscience, the sacredness of personal convictions, the right of the individual reason or judgment, which involved the inviolable sanctity of the region where God ruled and man obeyed. This was an idea that made religion a new force in the State. It was equal to its political enfranchisement; for religion had hitherto been, as it were, imprisoned in a body politic. By Catholicism it had been identified with the papal system, and the often immoral will of the church had been enforced on men and States as the will of God. By Anglicanism it had been incorporated in a State church which made spiritual too nearly the equivalent of civil obedience, and which too much respected or depended on the sovereign to be able to assert the supreme right and authority of religion. But with Independency no polity in the State was able to command conscience or coerce reason. Religion could not become an organized political unity without ceasing to be religious. Corporate action was so

impossible to it that it escaped a temptation which Free churches have often found fatal, that they be permitted to legislate for a State that they would not allow to legislate for them.

The religious strength of Independency was, therefore, its weakness as a denomination. It had no ecclesiastical ambitions; its ambitions were all religious. In its churches, godliness was the great thing; its creation and development their supreme duty. Men who believed were bound to be good; good men were the salt of the earth, and needful to its weal. Happiness was possible only as holiness was realized; and as to the pure all things were pure, so the righteous man must be righteous in everything, a saint while a citizen, a citizen while a saint. And so Independency forced to the front the idea that the convinced, pious, God-fearing man was the best citizen; that his duty was to make the State as religious as himself, which it could be, not by enforced conformity, but by becoming just in its laws, upright in its judgments, righteous in its conduct at home and abroad. As its church was a society of saints, its State ideal was a nation of righteous men living and acting righteously. It did not believe in either legislative or military machinery, but in men. Cromwell's model army, composed of men of spirit, convinced, devout men, who fought as unto God, expressed the mind of Independency, for it pursued its method. Its strong and true belief, sublime as true, was: — Create righteous citizens, and the State will realize righteousness; and with less than righteousness everywhere Independency could not be satisfied. For as Milton, its great poet and prophet, has fitly said, "A Commonwealth ought to be but as one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth and stature of an honest man, as big and compact in virtue as in body; for

look, what the grounds and causes are of single happiness to one man, the same ye shall find them to a whole State."* The whole life, public and private, penetrated and regulated by religion unto righteousness is the Independent ideal.

3. But this interpretation of the relation of religion to the State has, as we have said, its necessary counterpart in another interpretation of the relation in which the State ought to stand to religion. The obligation to godliness for the nation and individual alike was not the only thing Independency emphasized; it emphasized no less the immediacy and inviolable sanctity of the relations in which religion and conscience stand, and ought to be allowed to stand, to each other. While it affirmed the lordship of the conscience over the magistrate, it denied the lordship of the magistrate over the conscience; and so, by placing religion, not as organized polity, but as the authoritative and normative principle of life, over the State, it refused to the State the right either to institute or regulate, to alter or to control the religion. Christianity thus had a fair chance to penetrate the English State with its own ideas. Lecky† has indeed argued that toleration is the child of scepticism, possible only in an age when men have grown conscious of the difficulties that beset belief. But here he errs. Toleration is not only possible, but necessary, the moment religion is made a matter for the conscience rather

* *Of Reformation in England*, book ii, p. 11. Works. (Ed. 1834.) The main thesis which Milton discussed is: "That the church government must be conformable to the civil polity"—or that ecclesiastical and civil polity must agree—and "that no church-government is agreeable to monarchy, but that of bishops." It was an attempt that we are even to-day familiar with to read episcopacy out of royalty, though Milton himself had deprecated the very wish to "separate and distinguish the end and good of a monarch from the end and good of the monarchy, or of that from Christianity."

† *History of Rationalism in Europe*, vol. ii, p. 56 ff. (5th ed.)

than the magistrate; but it is impossible the moment it becomes an affair of the magistrate rather than the conscience. The period of most victorious certainty in the Christian church was also the period when it most strenuously pleaded for religious freedom. The Fathers before Constantine* understood that men compelled to embrace a religion were only coerced into hypocrisy, and they reproved the persecutions of Rome by affirming the supremacy of the conscience. So Tertullian argued † that to take away religious liberty and forbid free choice of worship was to promote impiety, for no man, much less a god, would care for a compulsory, which could only be a hateful because a hated homage. And again, he maintains ‡ that it is a common human right and prerogative of nature that every man should worship God according to his own convictions; that it is no religious thing to compel to religion, which must be spontaneously embraced to be embraced at all. And the older faith had in the hour of fatal transition its witnesses

* I am quite prepared to plead that we owe much to the first Christian emperor, but the fact of our deep obligation to him ought not to blind us to the further fact that, by introducing a pure Roman idea where a Hebrew would have been more in place, he did both religion and the church the utmost possible disservice. He was a converted man, but we may not say that either the emperor or his empire was converted. Hence the old notions of the inter-relations between religion and State were brought into Christianity. These old notions were quite unsuitable to Christianity; and were so largely because religion was to Rome a matter of legislation and not simply of nature. The citizens were of the same religion as Romans, not as men; it was an affair of nation, not of manhood.

† *Apologeticus*, c. 24. He says: "Adimere libertatem religionis et interdicere optionem divinitatis ut non liceat mihi colere quem velim, sed cogar colere quem nolim. Nemo se ab invito coli volet, ne homo quidem." And after enumerating the various goddesses of the provinces and cities, he complains, ironically, that they are allowed no choice: "Sed nos soli arcemur a religionis proprietate." And he concludes: "Bene quod omnium Deus est; cuius velimus aut nolimus omnes sumus."

‡ *Ad Scapulam*, c. 2. Hence he says: "Sed nec religionis est cogere religionem quæ sponte suscipi debeat, non vi."

in the noblest, who was also the most strenuous, of the then Fathers. So Athanasius says:* "It is proof that men have no confidence in their own faith when they use force and compel unwilling men to think as they do. It is the devil's method, because there is no truth in him, to work with hatchet and sword." And Hilary of Poitiers lamented† the degeneracy of the days when the Divine faith was recommended by an appeal to an earthly name; and the name of Christ made to seek the protection of a crowned head, as if He Himself had become impotent and helpless. Finely he told Constantius:‡ "You govern that all may enjoy sweet liberty; only by permitting each to live wholly according to his own convictions can peace be restored to the Church." "God is the Lord of the universe, and requires not an obedience which is forced"; and he even charged § the emperor with burdening the altar of God with the gold of the State. And Lactantius,|| in a noble and eloquent passage, argued that only reason, never compulsion, availed in religion, which could be defended not by slaying, but by dying; not by wasting, but by suffering; not by injustice, but by fidelity. Nothing was so much a matter of free choice as religion: where the heart does not love to serve, there it is not.

IV

1. Now the Fathers who so argued believed religion to be spiritual; what they argued against was its materializa-

* Hist. Arian., § 39.

† *Contra Arianos*, ii, 594. (Ed. Veron., 1730.)

‡ *Ad Constant*, lib. i, 535, c. 1.

§ Vel Aucentium. See in Migne, c. 5, on the church as not founded with human help. *Ad Const. Proper.*, i, 10.

|| *Instit. Div.*, v, 20.

tion by the power over it being transferred from the spirits where it lived and reigned to the imperial cabinet, where intrigue held sway and Christians became churchmen who lost in the game of politics the simplicity of their early faith and character. An imperial policy disguised in ecclesiastical terms and forms can never be tolerant; a spirit devoted to godliness, hating as radically evil and futile all ungodly methods and means for promoting godliness, can never be intolerant. Constantine did more against the new religion than was done by the misappropriation four or five centuries after he had lived of his name for a forged donation, which even Dante regretted; he restored the relation of religion to the State which had been realized under his predecessors. The persecutions under the Stuarts were no better and no worse than those under the emperors; and both were justified by the same reasons of State and policy. If religion be civil, and if all the people in a given area should be of the same faith and should worship the same gods in the same way as the legislative and administrative power of the State — then they were bound to cut off every head that thought otherwise than themselves. Independency, as an endeavour to realize the most ancient and least political Christianity, broke with the coercive policy which the political incorporation of the church in the State had made inevitable. The first English Congregationalist declared like Tertullian that "to compel religion, to plant churches by power, and to force submission to ecclesiastical government by laws and penalties, belonged not" to the magistrate. He said, in language that recalled Athanasius, that the Lord's people were "of the willing sort," driven by "conscience and not the power of man." And so he held that magistrates had as such "no authority over the Church," but "only to rule the commonwealth

in all outward justice."* And these principles, as fundamental to Independency, found in its earliest literature more or less complete expression. Barrowe and Greenwood maintained that "Christ was the only head of His Church"; that "His laws no man may alter"; that while it was "the duty of the prince to inquire out and renew the laws of God," yet in matters of religion conscience must be obeyed, "though all the princes of the world should prohibit the same upon pain of death."†

John Robinson argued that "civil causes" could never "bring forth spiritual effects," and that "compulsive laws" might create hypocrisy, but never the spirit that "received the word gladly."‡ Henry Jacob, when he returned from Holland to found the Church at Southwark, pleaded with King James for toleration, prayed that pious tender consciences might be left free to serve God in their own way. In his very notion of the Church the principle was contained which had been so well and boldly stated a year or so before by the Anglo-Dutch Baptists: "The magistrate is not to meddle with religion, or matters of conscience, nor to compel men to this or that form of religion, because Christ is the King and Lawgiver of the church and conscience."

2. Of all the religious ideas which were native to Independency, no one has so penetrated English thought or

* Robert Browne. *Treatise of Reformation without Tarying for Anie*, pp. 10, 11, 12, 15. We do not wonder that Dr. Dexter in his *Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years*, should claim for "the Founders" of Congregational Independency—by which he means Robert Browne—to be as he says the first writer in the English tongue to state "the true and the modern notion of the relation of the magistrate to the church, and so to formulate a "true doctrine of toleration," pp. 103, 697–708.

† See Barrowe's *Brief Discoverie of the False Church*, also his *Collection of certaine Sclanderous Articles*, and Greenwood's *Answer to George Gifford*.

‡ Works, ii, 488.

so moulded English polity as toleration. Its history in England has still to be written. It does not fall within our province to trace even its main outlines. One thing is certain, whatever may have been the dream — so sadly contradicted by his practice — of Sir Thomas More, it was as an actual and realizable ideal the creation of Independency. The two branches into which it so soon divided, the Congregational and Baptist, may have at first differed as regards the statement and application of the principle; but on this point there is no doubt that "a whole generation before the Treatise" either of Busher on *Religious Peace* or Murton on *Persecution* Robert Browne in formulating the congregational theory formulated also the modern doctrine of "liberty of conscience."* The church of Helwys may have been more thorough-going than the church of Jacob, just as the tracts of Busher and Murton while more logical may also have been more unqualified in their notion and doctrine of religious liberty than were the expositions of the scholarly and scholastic Ainsworth, or the discussions of the sober and large-minded Robinson. Hanserd Knollys and Roger Williams may have held and suffered for a toleration more comprehensive than was desired by Philip Nye or William Bridge. Many things may help to explain the difference. The Baptists learned much from their Dutch friends, both Arminian and Mennonite; while the Dutch theological affinities and relationships of the Congregationalists tended altogether in an opposite direction. But these are points that do not concern us: this alone does — the toleration, qualified or unqualified, was in each case based on the new ideal of religion and the church. The new ideal of religion proclaimed the rights of the individual conscience; the new idea of the church its duties and

* Dr. Dexter's *Congregationalism*, &c., p. 103.

obligations. The main matter was no longer uniformity, but reality — not the organization of religious forms, but the conversion of the soul and the regulation of the life by truths directly believed and completely obeyed.

And the significant matter is that, save on this ground, toleration can never be, and has never been, logically claimed and defended by a man believing religion to be true. In the history of liberal and literary religious thought in England, no four names are more honoured and more worthy of honour than those of Francis Bacon, William Chillingworth, Jeremy Taylor, and John Locke; and each is an illustrious proof of our thesis. Bacon's position is stated in two places: the essay on "Religion," first published in 1599, when the question was still hotly discussed; the second in the essay on "Unity in Religion," published in 1625. Each contains the familiar line from Lucretius,

"Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum,"

and explains its occasion. The true God is jealous — though no attempt is made to explain what jealousy means — and men must observe the bounds of unity. The line of Lucretius is introduced as an illustration of religion using the temporal sword; but if he had seen the St. Bartholomew massacres in France and the gunpowder plot in England, he would "have been seven times the epicure and atheist he was." Bacon may be said to deprecate any act which turns the church "into a work of pirates and assassins." Chillingworth's great service was to oppose to the idea of the church and its authority the idea that "the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." And this religion is one that authority cannot interpret, only "right reason" can; interpretation must be

by the conscience for the conscience.* Taylor's great argument for freedom, as he calls it — or "Liberty of Prophesying" — is based on the nature of faith, and toleration is made dutiful because faith is rational; it lives by persuasion, not by polities. His work convinces in the degree that it limits the authority of the church and affirms the rights of the reason. The church, he says, "has power to intend our faith, but not to extend it, to make our belief more evident, but not more large and comprehensive." She has no power to declare any article "necessary which before was not necessary. By so doing she makes the narrow way to be even narrower, and chalks out one more path to the devil than he had before."† Locke's plea for toleration which started from a conception of the church he owed to Independency, was cogent in the very degree in which it logically developed and applied the conception. Take away the ideas of the essential voluntariness of religion and the religious society, and the very basis is taken away from Locke's argument.‡

Independency, then, prevailed over its enemies. The whole movement towards religious liberty has been a move-

* Works, ii, 170, 404, 411, but see pars. 38, 39. (Oxford Ed.)

† *Liberty of Prophesying*, Sec. i, cc. 12, 13.

‡ See the opening of Locke's first letter on "Toleration." As he proceeds he argues in a fashion all "Independents" agreed with and loved: "The care of souls cannot belong to the civil magistrate, because his power consists only in outward force; but true and saving religion consists in the inward persuasion of the mind." (*Works*, 1769, ii. 225.) Locke besides this, which we may call his religious reason, had as well what may be termed his metaphysical or philosophical reason. What this is may be seen if we turn to his *Human Understanding*, Bk. iv, c. xvi, § 4. Fraser says (ii, 374): "The section presents part of Locke's argument." Fraser, in a note on p. 371, quotes Cudworth as saying that "truth and error are usually to be found on both sides of a great question"; and on 374 adds Glanvill's name to those of Chillingworth and Taylor as a "divine" who has "pleaded for toleration of inevitable differences of opinion."

ment towards the realization of its ideal. The moment Chillingworth forgot his notion of the Christian religion, and acted in behalf of the ecclesiastical polity he believed, his theory broke down. Taylor the bishop and ecclesiastic was a radical and embodied contradiction of Taylor the apologist for freedom. The independent idea is the only sure basis for a theory of toleration, and in practice its only complete realization.

V

1. Here our discussion leads us to the threshold of a great subject, which we cannot even glance at — the action of Independency on the State and people and religion of England. The principles it embodies have been progressively victorious principles, ever securing more recognition and authority in the State, and ever making it a roomier and healthier home for reasonable and religious spirits. By what seems an act almost of inspired foresight, Independency set about creating the ideas, forming the societies, and realizing the conditions best fitted to make religion a living moral power in the State, and to make the State stand in its proper relation to religion. And Providence has crowned its history with a success that more than rewards its centuries of obscurity, civil disability, and ecclesiastical conflict. Its success is not a thing of statistics; figures can in no way represent it. It is embodied in the legislation, in the civil rights, in the religious liberties so slowly and so hardly won, in the political duties so strenuously fulfilled, in the public opinion and public conduct of the English people. Thanks mainly to Independency, the English people have learned that the

State inimical to religious freedom is the worst enemy of religion; that to tolerate only one church in the State is to identify the State with the church, and thus to do the utmost injury to the religion of Jesus Christ. Nor are these its only services. No student of English history can deny that it created a new conscience for conduct in the English people, new qualities of character and types of virtue, and added some of the most illustrious names to the long roll of Christian heroes and saints. But while creating a loftier and more ethical ideal of the Christian man, it also lifted the conception of the church of Jesus Christ; made the church less civil and more spiritual, less political and more social, less sacerdotal and more moral. It placed religion above the sovereign as above the man, made the church as a society independent of the State, but as the bearer of the ideals and truths, as the vehicle and exponent of the religion of Jesus Christ, related to the State as to the individual — related, that is, as the teacher and preacher of righteousness, with a commission which comes direct from the Eternal.

2. The attitude of the Anglican church to the sovereign was an inexpressible humiliation to the man who understood and believed and loved the ideal of Independency. It was so by virtue of the varied infidelities it involved. It contradicted the fundamental principle of a return to the way and idea of Christ and His apostles. It offended the strong belief in the dignity, the spiritual kinghood and priesthood of every Christian man. It sinned against the profound conviction that a man who was a citizen in the kingdom of God, who held office and exercised rule in His church, ought to be a godly man. It were almost impossible to enlighten the Anglican as to the feelings of the Independent who hears him maintain the most unhistorical thesis

that an utter scapegrace like the second Charles, a crypto-Catholic to boot, was by the grace of God king of England and the head of the English Church. It would have seemed to him too grotesque for impiety had it not been too bitter for tears. Time never inflicted a more deserved revenge than when it forced the Anglican to see a king by his own divine right the head of his church, while a papist in profession and in deed. Yet it ought to have been a less humiliation than was the sight in the same position of his less honest and as unclean avowed papistic brother. But humiliations of that sort can be suffered by Anglicanism alone; they are impossible to Independency. Strong in the faith that Christ is king, that where He reigns no sovereign has any right or title to interfere, that the surest note of a Christian man is his being obedient to Christ in all things, and the surest note of the Christian church is its working in Christ's way for Christ's ends — the Independent lived through the old days of darkness into these days of light, and helped to make the day when it dawned as the day of rich fruition, and still richer promise we find it to be.

ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλὰ ἐστε συμπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὔξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι.—Ephesians ii. 19–22.

ἠγησάμην οὖν, εἰ παραζεύξειέ τις
χρηστῷ πονηρὸν λέκτρον, οὐκ ἂν εὐτεκνεῖν,
ἐσθλοῖν δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν ἐσθλὸν ἂν φῦναι γόνον.
Eurip., *Fragm.*, 524.

τὸ γὰρ τῆς πολιτικῆς τέλος ἄριστον ἐτίθεμεν, αὕτη δὲ πλείστην ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖται τοῦ ποιούς τινας καὶ ἀγαθοὺς τοὺς πολίτας ποιῆσαι καὶ πρακτικοὺς τῶν καλῶν.
Eth. Nic. 1, 10, 1099, b. 29.

λυσιτελεῖ γάρ, οἶμαι, ἡμῖν ἡ ἀλλήλων δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀρετή.
Plato, *Protagoras*, § 46.

Si suam potestatem ad Dei cultum maxime dilatandum majestati ejus famulam faciunt; si Deum timent, diligunt, colunt; si plus amant illud regnum, ubi non timent habere consortes.—Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 5, cap. xxiv.

Non esse petendum ab Imperatoribus, ut ipsam haeresim juberent omnino non esse, pœnam constituendo eis qui in illa esse voluissent: sed hoc potius constituerent, ut eorum furiosas violentias non paterentur qui veritatem catholicam vel prædicarent loquendo, vel legerent constituendo.—*Ib. Epistolæ*, 185, 25.

Wo das Evangelium ist, da muss eine heilige christliche Kirche sein.—Köstlin, *Luthers Theologie*, vol. ii. p. 535.

Though God for less than ten just persons would not spare Sodom, yet if you can find, after due search, but only one good thing in prelaty, either to religion or civil government, to king or parliament, to prince or people, to law, liberty, wealth, or learning, spare her, let her live, let her spread among ye, till with her shadow all your dignities and honours, and all the glory of the land be darkened and obscured. But on the contrary, if she be found to be malignant, hostile, destructive to all these, as nothing can be surer, then let your severe and impartial doom imitate the divine vengeance; rain down your punishing force upon this godless and oppressing government, and bring such a dead sea of subversion upon her, that she may never in this land rise more to afflict the holy reformed church and the elect people of God.—Milton (ed. 1834), *The Reason of Church Government*, p. 54.

If you require a further answer, it will not misbecome a Christian to be either more magnanimous or more devout than Scipio was; who, instead of other answer to the frivolous accusations of Petilius the tribune, "This day, Romans," (saith he) "I fought with Hannibal prosperously; let us all go and thank the gods, that gave us so great a victory": in like manner will we now say, not caring otherwise to answer this unprotestant-like objection: In this age, Britons, God hath reformed his church after many hundred years of popish corruption; in this age he hath freed us from the intolerable yoke of prelates and papal discipline; in this age he hath renewed our protestation against all those yet remaining dregs of superstition.—*Ib. Animadversions upon the Remonstrant's Defence against Smectymnuus*, p. 65.

Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπε, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστος, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος."

καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ "Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαριωνά, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέ σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω, ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.—Matthew xvi. 17, 18.

εἰ δέ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνεικος εἶναι, ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ.—1 Corinthians xi. 16.

Mundo evocatum vel collectum coetum fidelium, sanctorum inquam omnium communionem, eorum videlicet, qui deum veterum in Christo servatore per verbum et super summum vere cognoscunt et rite colunt, denique omnibus bonis per Christum gratuito oblatis fide participant.—*Confessio Helvetica*, II. 17.

Ecclesia militans est visibilis et invisibilis.—A. Diest.

Ecclesia invisibilis credenda, visibilis colenda.—Alst, 545.

Ecclesia est coetus electorum a deo e statu miseriæ in statum gratiæ efficaciter vocatorum et sub uno capite Christo collatorum.—Heikgger.

Nec vero satis est electorum turbam cogitatione animoque complecti, nisi talem ecclesiæ unitatem cogitemus, in quam nos esse insitos vere simus persuasi. Nisi enim sub capite nostro Christo coadunati simus reliquis omnibus membris, nulla nos manet spes hæreditatis futuræ.—Calvin, *Institutio Christianæ Religionis*, Lib. 4, cap. i, 2.

The teachers of the Church ought not to be dictators, or masters of men's faith, but helpers of men's faith; for they are not to make religion, but to show it. They do not take away the key of knowledge from the people, as our Saviour chargeth the Pharisees, or as S. Austin saith, they do not command faith in men, upon peril of damnation, to show their superiority, or to practise as governors: but they do appear in the good office of discretion, and giving men counsel. 'Tis not pride of ruling and shewing power, but out of compassion to lead people into the way of truth, and to recover them out of error and mistake.—Whichcote, *Discourses*, vol. i, p. 273.

For in point of natural religion (which takes in sobriety, righteousness, and piety) you may easily satisfy any man by reason. For no man is in any thing more certain, than that he ought to be sober and temperate; than that he ought to deal righteously, and so as he would be dealt by; and that he ought to carry himself equally and fairly; and that he ought to fear and reverence the Deity: for these are the dictates of natural light.—*Ib.*, p 269.

This is true Liberty, when freeborn men,
Having to advise the public, may speak free,
Which he who can, and will, deserves high praise;
Who neither can, nor will, may hold his peace;
What can be juster in a state than this?

Euripid., *Hicetid.*, 437; Milton (ed. 1834), *Areopagitica*, p. 103.

But in true religion there is nothing which the reason of mankind can challenge or object against: nothing wherein the reason of mankind may not have so good an account, so as to have satisfaction.—Whichcote, *Discourses*, vol. i, p. 267.

Religion is not so slight a thing as a naked profession, or a bare denomination. Glorious things are reported in scripture of religion. It hath deservedly a very great name in the world; for see what effects religion doth attain; through a man's religion, he is an habitation of God, through the Spirit; a man is made a temple of the Holy Ghost, a man is made partaker of the divine nature, and his conversation is in Heaven. Wherefore, if we profess religion, let us do such things, by virtue of the spirit of religion, which others can neither do nor counterfeit.—*Ib.*, vol. ii, p. 440.

By worldly wisdom we mean skill, knowledge, and dexterity in the mystery of arts and sciences; either mental or intellectual, or manual and mechanical; the skill of tongues and languages, and prudence in the administration of the affairs of this life. Now all these are truths and realities; for they are gifts of God. And these men are well accomplished, and are all profitable instruments in the commonwealth, and fit to do service. God doth own these perfections in men, for God gives them.—*Ib.*, vol. iv, p 297.

How then should the dim taper of Constantine's age, that had such need of snuffing, extend any beam to our times, wherewith we might hope to be better lighted, than by those luminaries that God hath set up to shine to us far nearer hand? And what reformation he wrought for his own time it will not be amiss to consider; he appointed certain times for fasts and feasts, built stately churches, gave large immunities to the clergy, great riches and promotions to bishops, gave and ministered occasion to bring in a deluge of ceremonies, thereby either to draw in the heathen by a resemblance of their rites, or to set a gloss upon the simplicity and plainness of Christianity; which, to the gorgeous solemnities of paganism, and the sense of the world's children, seemed but a homely and yeomanly religion; for the beauty of inward sanctity was not within their prospect.—Milton (ed. 1834), *Of Reformation in England*, p. 7.

> Ah Constantine! of how much ill was cause
> Not thy conversion, but those rich domains,
> That the first wealthy pope received of thee!—*Ib.*, p. 8.

Then, amidst the hymns and hallelujahs of saints, some one may perhaps be heard offering at high strains in new and lofty measures, to sing and celebrate thy divine mercies and marvellous judgments in this land throughout all ages; whereby this great and warlike nation, instructed and inured to the fervent and continual practice of truth and righteousness, and casting far from her the rags of her old vices, may press on hard to that high and happy emulation to be found the soberest, wisest, and most Christian people at that day, when thou, the eternal and shortly-expected King, shalt open the clouds to judge the several kingdoms of the world, and distributing national honours and rewards to religious and just commonwealths, shalt put an end to all earthly tyrannies, proclaiming thy universal and mild monarchy through heaven and earth.—*Ib.*, p. 21.

INTRODUCTORY

THE discussions which have so far circled round our main problem have been occupied with what may be termed the church in history. The idea is twofold: there is (*α*) the church, which is related to Christ as He to God; it is His incarnation, speaks to His Eternal Presence, witnesses to His character, and is the immortal from which His beneficent activity has assumed. There is (*β*) history, which is here conceived as the written and registered life of collective man, especially as expressed (i) in the thought which becomes either philosophy or doctrine, whether climbing to heaven, so as to stand face to face with God, or descending to earth, so as to interpret man in his history and read order into the phenomena of the world; (ii) in the emotions and imagination which beget religion and produce art; (iii) in the will which creates virtue and performs the duties belonging to a religion reckoned as Christ's; and (iv) in the conscience which sees the dutiful, and either sanctions or upholds it. From these discussions we must now turn to the New Testament, and inquire what it meant by "the Church" and "its worship"; what by "the Christ" who made the church by making the men who composed it, and what these men did and thought when they built it, and made it, themselves, and their time the model for later days. There are therefore certain preliminary questions which must be considered before any one of our subjects can be intelligently discussed.

I

1. The lesson of history is eminently simple, yet it is one living men are ever in need of learning: we ought to be better judges of what is written in the New Testament than even those who wrote it, especially as the men who composed the writings did not, as a rule, know who were engaged in writing it, or the things written. Experience must, especially if racial, count for something. The apostles or their contemporaries, who saw the new religion born, testified to what they saw, yet they neither saw nor knew everything. The foundation which they themselves laid may have seemed to them the whole; yet it is not the whole to those who still live. Man has not changed, though time has, which has built a superstructure, here good, there bad; and in order to be judged the superstructure must be known. The history of Christianity is one thing now, and was another thing then. Our experience of the religion is, while longer and larger, as valid as the apostolic.

The Christian religion has had as much to do with the making of the atmosphere we breathe as Judaism or Hellenism, or the two combined, had to do with the formation of the atmosphere breathed by the apostles. And in their case, as in ours, atmosphere included literature. Now we may interpret the literature through the history of the religion, and remember its historical achievements, yet it would seem to us an act of incomparable impertinence to say: "The men who saw the mean beginnings of the religion are the best judges of its intrinsic truth," or "We have only to see what they saw as they saw it, to think as they thought, and to believe as they did." This may be equivalent to saying: "For us history has no meaning and experience no worth." Nor

should we be any wiser were we to say: "We need not concern ourselves about the creative period, nor about the persons, ideas, and facts which constitute the religion; it is enough to be satisfied with its sweet counsels in life, its gracious promises in death, and the light it sheds upon what lies beyond the grave." To think thus were to imagine that religion is not the synonym of truth, and that its true and high function is rather to comfort the individual than to organize the race, or to discipline man for the pursuit of righteousness.

Yet as our study must be critical to be penetrative, it is not our purpose to concede to any one the right to say: "To interrogate is to discredit the witnesses, to analyze their words is to doubt their veracity, to look at the persons whose history they write, or at the events whose occurrence they attest, in the calm light of reason, is to lower their majesty and insult their truth." For this implies that research is vanity and knowledge is sin; that to believe the false is nobler than to trust the true; and that there is more of God in the ignorance which does not reason than in the thought which thirsts to know. And these are things we do not believe. For the New Testament is to us on the lowest ground not the mere book of a religion, the recorded testimonies of the men who saw the religion born. As such, indeed, its veracity could be so established as to be indubitable; but Scripture has a signification beyond history, for it is simply a chapter in the life of God which He Himself has caused to be written; and its character is more than a personal vindication; it is an assertion of "Eternal Providence."

2. Our work may thus be defined as, in the broadest sense interpretative; but we have still something to say about the book we would interpret. What man has written

he can investigate. The only investigation which counts must be based upon knowledge, which may be best represented as the method which mind follows when it seeks by some act of interpretation to discover truth. Now, interpretation so conceived is at once an art, an action, and a process. As an art it separates the true from the false, and can be learned; as an action it is the intelligent use of the art, to read and find out the truth embodied in literature, or the conduct, the character, and the institutions it describes; as a process it is the action viewed as continuous, the continuity being due to the constant application of a knowledge in which there is no impiety to literature. So conceived, interpretation cannot be forbidden. There is no literature, however sacred, which forbids it. The sanctity, which would depreciate the Creator in the man He had created, would be curiously akin to profanity. Were a revelation fenced off from rational investigation, greater divinity would be claimed for the book than either for the God who speaks in it and of whom it speaks, or the religion whose founding it narrates and whose founders it describes. For God and religion alike live in mind just as mind feels free to think of both, and to criticize them; the fascination of the two for reason consists in their ability to play upon it, to set it the problems the reason feels it must solve or die. We do not here assume that a religion proves its divinity by answering every possible question reason can ask. Reason satisfied would be man dissatisfied, for his education would be ended, his progress arrested, and all hopefulness taken out of the race by its doubts being removed. Hence those who in the supposed interests of religion speak disdainfully of knowledge are in reality irreligious, and sin equally against man and God. They say, in effect: "Religion is but a form of law which custom

has sanctioned, and which lives not as truth or duty, but as law; its ideal has no place for knowledge, but simply for the authority that corrects rather than constrains."

II

1. Knowledge, then, has its function alike in the Christian religion and in its literature. And what is knowledge as applied to letters save criticism? And criticism, as here conceived, falls into four classes: (α) Literary, (β) historical, (γ) religious, and (δ) doctrinal. (α) Literary criticism is of two kinds, textual and documentary; the first, which is known as the lower criticism, concerns the purity or impurity of the text, or the record as written; the second, which is named the higher criticism, concerns the date, the sequence, the authenticity, and the authorship of the writings themselves. (β) Historical criticism discusses events and persons, with the view of determining their order and reality, their kind and quality, whether they are transcendental or empirical, supernatural or natural. The ideas which literary criticism tests and interprets, historical criticism applies and illustrates, using the books as lamps for the illumination of the moment or the movement it would understand. Baur* justly complained that what Strauss gave was a criticism of the Gospel history without any criticism of the Gospels as literature; and he argued that historical criticism must be based on literary; that till we knew when, why, and by whom the Gospels were written it was impossible to speak sensible or trustworthy words concerning the history narrated. Without the criticism of literature there could be neither order nor accuracy in our knowledge of history; without historical criticism there

* *Untersuchungen ueber die can. Ev.* (1847), p. 40.

would be nothing to keep thought face to face with reality. The two criticisms are thus inseparably connected: the criticism which does not shed light upon a given period through its literature, pursued a method without reason and reasoned without method; while in history the criticism which does not arrange and test its documents can do nothing save beat the air.* But (γ) literary and historical criticism are incomplete without a criticism of religion. We must know the authenticity, the order, and the origin of the literature which is the medium for the expression of the constituent and characteristic ideas or beliefs of the religion. And we must know the history which shows the persons not as sporadic and arbitrary incidents, but as actors in a drama which has a unity with the creative mind. To know the persons we must study the literature which describes them and the ideas they believed. But neither the ideas nor the persons can be known in isolation; ideas do not come into being unbidden; and persons are not uncaused entities which can live without corporate being. The two are, indeed, relative, for ideas which are articulated in institutions produce in persons types of character as distinctive as themselves. Hence where there is literature there must be history, and where these are religion must be, the three being interdependent while distinct. (δ) Criticism has also to do with doctrine, though not with dogma. These differ, indeed, yet are connected. Dogma is uttered and sanctioned doctrine, or doctrine decreed by a council or a church to be the truth of God. Doctrine is

* I cannot allow a scholar even as learned and acute as the late Robertson Smith to identify "Higher" and "Historical" criticism (*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 1st Ed., p. 105). The criticism he described was purely literary; but history is distinct from literature, and has a criticism of its own.

the principle which a church may teach without any formal endorsement; but dogma is the idea which a church has judged to be necessary alike to its being and its well-being. Doctrine is the unuttered and uncertified truth, tried by no council, expressed in no symbol, and accepted by no church; dogma is ratified and sanctioned doctrine, faith made intelligible and public by being set out in a creed, which is enforced by sanctions. Dogma stands in awe of the critic, whom it regards as its insatiable foe, expecting to receive no mercy from him, as it showed none to him in the day of its power. Thus criticism has no quarrel with doctrine; but has an unpitying enemy in dogma. While the one knows and reveres it as a friend, the other fears and dislikes it as a foe, and a foe who loves to tell unwelcome truths.

2. As applied to the New Testament, criticism is, therefore, but man's method of bringing out the religious signification of the Book. It begins by proclaiming the position that on this Book, as a foundation of truth and fact, every Christian church has built or builds, and could not without its willing or reluctant sanction continue to be. This is quite independent of the venerable question — whether the Book of our religion owes its being to the Church, and can be read and interpreted by its authority alone, or whether the Church must be judged by its agreement with the Book. We may, indeed, say: what is proved to be of the essence of the religion of Jesus, ought not to be made a superficial accident in a Christian church; or, conversely, what is of a church's essence ought not to be an accident in the religion. If either principle is affirmed, the duty is the same: the obligation of the Church to study at first hand the documents which express the mind of Him through whom and for whom it is.

While the above may be said to represent positions which underlie our discussions as a whole, the principle whence it is proposed to start is a special form or mode of historical rather than literary criticism. The Old Testament is the proper introduction to the New, especially as in ancient times Christianity would never have got upon its feet if it had not been identified with historical and national Judaism. It owed to the religion which preceded it, the God it worshipped; and to the synagogue the forms in which it worshipped Him. This determines our starting-point: God and His worship.

I

WORSHIP

SONG is a given gift, the direct bestowment of the Almighty, granted that while men hear in a high and susceptible mood His truth may speak more potently to them. He who possesses this gift can wed strong feeling and exalted thought to words so true and real as to need noble music for their fit interpretation. But of all songs the sublimest is the Psalm which comes by the direct inspiration of God. It has a sound whose voice is like the sea, in which the mind of the Eternal becomes articulate in time; it yearns towards the infinite out of which it comes; it seeks to wake the Deity which has so long slumbered in man, drugged by his senses and numbed by his too conscious limitations. And our eighty-fourth Psalm is a song of this order, full of a homesickness so pathetic and unutterable that nothing save the realization of its desire can cure it. But the home is no place which lies to the retrospective imagination gleaming with a light that never was on sea or shore; it is constituted by a person, the unborn, the undying God. The sickness is of man pining unto utter faintness of spirit for Him who is his life.

I

1. We neither do know, nor need to know, who made the Psalm to believe its truth or to feel its inspiration. A song may be all the mightier that it is nameless, for then it may speak to us with the voice, not of a person, but of a race, which is at its highest as if it were the voice of God. But this Psalm has been ascribed to David, aged and fugitive; and the view is, if not true to fact, yet true to idea. We can conceive him alike in the situation that prompted it and with the soul that made it. He had a nature that loved best when it had lost, for then it most needed and knew its need. But his faith was too strong and his soul too strenuous to allow him ever to feel as if he had lost God. There are men who in the dense darkness grow helpless from the fear that the vanished light may never return; other men only the more wistfully watch for the pale gleam on the mountain-top, or the red streak in the sky, that tells of the breaking day. And David turned as by instinct, his face in the darkness towards the east, saw the earliest beams steal up; and even, while other ears were deaf, heard the whisper of the coming dawn.

Can we imagine him at the moment when this song issued like a being breathing thoughtful breath out of his brave and quickened spirit? He is an old man, many wintry storms have bleached his once ruddy face; passions, now indulged and now only ravening the more because denied indulgence, have seamed his once smooth cheek; and the mind that darkly plotted concerning God, has turned the open forehead of youth into the furrowed brow of age. The firm and skilful hand that could once sling the unerring stone has become feeble and thewless; the nerves that never shook or failed have turned into nerves that will

not be steadied even where danger does not threaten; the inflexible will that could tame the lawless bands of Adullam has now, through struggles and seductions manifold, grown too infirm to command his servile court, or to control his conquered capital. He is indeed what ought to be the most pathetic of all sights to every son of ambition — an exhausted hero sitting in the shadow of his own glorious past, uncheered by the dignity of age or by the prospect of an honoured and reposeful future. And his experiences had been the bitter products of two ingratitudes, which yet were one, a national and a filial. The creation of his manhood's strength could not bear with his age's feebleness; the people the hero had made had utterly forgotten the hero who made them. And the shame of the apostasy was deepened largely by the vanity of a son. By David's side stood the young man Absalom, and to him God had given the wonderful gift of beauty, which meant in his case the power to win the heart through the eye. He had no heroic past; he had done no illustrious deeds, spoken no winged words, founded no state, showed no statesmanship; but he was beautiful, and so seemed good, especially to those who, without memory or magnanimity, had no soul for greatness. His long hair fell in godlike curls on his shoulders, and when he stood in the gate — a splendid figure all men could see — and dispensed a justice which all could appreciate, the people, forgetting that his good, like his beauty, was inherited, and neither earned nor achieved, said: "How glorious he is! how much fitter to be our king than the worn-out old man in the palace." They did not think: "He must be an ignoble youth who has no better use for his beauty than to steal the hearts of the people from his own father"; or that "an ancient hero whom years have endowed with experience and with wisdom is better than a

young man whose only virtue lies in his body, and may best be described as physical grace." But instead they argued: "The graceful man is also the good, and since he 'stands beside the way of the gate' and dispenses justice, we will make him our king." They acted as they thought; and did not dream that they reasoned like fools and behaved as knaves. And they had their way. Absalom became their king and David a fugitive. But as he wandered in the land of the stranger, what he mourned was not the lost luxury of his palace, nor his perished dignity, nor his stolen kinghood, nor the ungrateful infidelity of his people, nor even the filial rebellion of his son; but rather his absence from the temple and the worship of his God. And these seemed more delightful in retrospect than even in enjoyment; and so he cried: "How lovely are Thy tabernacles, O Jehovah of hosts! My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of Jehovah: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God."

2. Here two things are emphasized, and each in terms that continue to rise ever higher: (i) the emotions which possess the man, and (ii) the object toward which they are directed.

(i) What is here termed the "emotions" may perhaps be better described as the imagination which the heart speaks through and to. "How amiable are Thy tabernacles." "Amiable" is a foreign word, much depreciated in sense by the handling of three hundred years. "Lovely" is a better though a homelier word, especially as to us the "lovely" is also the lovable and the love-worthy. What we believe to be good we feel to be beautiful and we trust as true. Hence it is what we desire, what the "soul longeth, yea, even fainteth" to possess. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick"; but the hope which is born of love maketh

the sick heart whole. Yet so penetrative is the love which begets hope that "my heart and my flesh cry out." There is such a thing as a consuming desire, though the man who desires is not consumed; and here the desire is as deathless as the God who is desired.

(ii) But it is only the place connected with the worship of God that seems lovely through Him. "*Thy* tabernacles, O Jehovah of hosts." The tent of God in Israel appeals to the imagination of the exile; he sees in his dreams by night and in his visions by day God and the people, and he himself amid the people as the king, who yet stands before God as a sinner, a man who must worship and will praise. And what a fine touch is there: "Jehovah of hosts!" the defeated and defenceless exile trusts in the God who commands the hosts of heaven and the armies of earth; and so believes that he does not identify his cause with the Eternal, and ask God to avenge him. There is no note of insincerity in faith like the appeal which would make it God's duty to side with *us* and vindicate *our* name and claims. But David seeks God for Himself, and not for any help in the evil day he may obtain from Him. "The courts of the Lord"; the place where Jehovah in His majesty visits the people and the people in their humility expiate their sins by sacrifice. "For the living God." There the object of love and desire stands in splendid simplicity and nakedness. Deity, but the living, not a dead God, no idol, the work of man's hands, no vacant name, the product of man's mind, no feeble, flattered monarch isolated from the lascivious multitude by His might and His majesty; but the one "living God." The cause of all worship is the cry for God; the end of all worship is to satisfy the soul that feels it must find God or it will die.

II

1. We must begin by noting that a Christian church is not a temple, whether Hebrew or heathen. These two, the temple and the church, are symbols, which signify at once similar and dissimilar things. They alike exist for the worship of God, but they differ both as regards the God they worship and the worship they offer Him. God is more and better than man thinks. The temple was the distinctive home of the old faiths, the creation of their genius and the epitome of their character; but the church is peculiar to the Christian religion, defines its nature and reflects its qualities. The temple was built in a sacred grove or in a place it consecrated, which signified that God was chained to the spot; thither man had to come to find Him and to present the offerings He loved. But we build our churches in cities and amid the haunts of men; and they speak to us of a God who is at home everywhere, can be found anywhere, and wherever He is He seeks the souls of men whom He loves to save. In the temple the priest officiated and offered the sacrifices that pleased his god; in the church the people offer the sacrifices of prayer and praise, and a man with the prophetic gift speaks concerning the truth of the God whose law ought to rule the whole man and to govern every life. In the temple man tried by the shedding of blood to propitiate god; in the church a gospel of divine grace is preached which commands all men everywhere to come to a God who is reconciled. In the temple men gave to god that they might get from him what he alone could give; but in the church men worship a God whose favours they cannot purchase, who ever does what becomes Himself, and who has endured sorrow and suffered unto sacrifice that He may win

the lost. The deity that dwelt in the temple was thus infinitely lower than the God preached in the church; the one had a majesty which had hardly escaped from the passions of narrow men and the prejudices of the tribe, but the other has the beauty and the excellence of a love that cannot be quenched. And as the God of the church is the more glorious, so also is the man. In the church man offers the sacrifice of himself — and he is of too infinite a value to be purchased — as well as the obedience of his manhood, the love of his life. He does not owe his dignity to the tribe or the nation, but it belongs to him by nature: he is moral, immortal, a miniature deity, bound by his conscience to the throne of the Eternal. These are attributes no son of the temple was ever conceived to possess. The loveliness of Thy church belongs to Thee, O God; while to man belongs the spirit that must see Thee to live!

2. The temple and church, which so differ as regards their idea of God, differ also in their ideas of worship, though to the church belongs the glory that excelleth. Let us freely concede to the temple a sensuous sublimity which appeals to eye and ear; but for the church we claim a spiritual sublimity which appeals to soul and conscience. There are men who think that the function of religion is to be the minister of art, that high art justifies religion, that a mean or neglected art passes on it an irrevocable condemnation. And such men say to us with wearisome iteration: "The ages of faith are behind, and the decadence of faith is around. Look at the temples of ancient Egypt; how splendidly they become the proud inscription which a king carved above a portal he had built: 'Made for eternity, time withers before me.' Study the massive sculptures which guard, like immobile

deities, the temples of Assyria, and do they not speak of a magnificent faith as well as of a mighty empire? And do we not owe Greek art, which we modern men love to describe as the apotheosis of the beautiful, to Greek religion? And was not this art so religious that a man who looked upon the image of Zeus stole out as from the divine presence, saying, 'Lo! I have beheld God'? Or take the marvellous cathedrals of our own Middle Ages, with a space which seems vast as heaven, with pillars so immense as to suggest the invisible shafts that hold up the starry roof of earth with aisles and arches, rounded or pointed, which were made to reverberate with song, — do they not recall the mighty avenues of the primeval forest, with tracery so delicately wrought as to be most beautiful where most grotesque? In their very shape the Christian religion is expressed, its history in the names and uses of their several parts; its doctrines are symbolized in altars, windows, steps, chapels; its virtues in the seats men filled and the places they occupied. May we not say, then, that the faith the ages had lived by built itself in temple or cathedral as by celestial art an everlasting monument? And now compare with these temples and cathedrals the poor and hideous, the unstable and impermanent, places men now erect for what they are pleased to call 'worship.' What are they but meeting-houses that know no comfort and give no inspiration, or chapels of horrid and hybrid Gothic, built by artifice and patchwork of shoddy brick or tasteless stone, mere shops where men may preach or persons pray, but where no lover of art can demean himself by worshipping? For as is the place such will be the transactions within it. The ancient worship suited the ancient temple, the robed priests, the singing men, the stately music fitly rendered by a full-throated choir, the

ox perfumed and garlanded for the sacrifice, the procession that wound in and out of the sacred groves as if they feared to come in unseemly haste into the awful presence of the Deity. And the cathedral was fitly built and endowed for mediæval worship. So was the monastery, where the monk, who ceased to kneel on the cold stone floor of his cell, silently stole out that he might with his brothers glide into the church where they all raised their voices in the matin or the vesper hymn; and while the world hastened to its commerce or to its sin they uplifted to God an awed yet beautiful worship. But what a contrast to all this do you find in the begrimed men, in the ill-dressed or the over-dressed women, who meet in our modern chapels to sing fulsome hymns or utter vulgar and familiar prayers to a Deity they make too like themselves to stand in awe of!"

3. So speaks the man of art concerning what he conceives to be the artistic and the inartistic in worship. But is he not in each case indulging an uninformed imagination? There is a nobler art than any known to the fine arts — the art of making men, of governing life, of forming states, of realizing an ordered freedom. When we are told that ancient religion was the mother of art, and ancient art the minister and exponent of religion, we ask, What of the people? How did they stand related to the religion? Was it their moral master, or they its ethical servants? Did it think of them, educate, emancipate, uplift, refine them? If it failed to benefit the humanity in man for which all art is, can it be said to have cultivated or achieved the highest of all the arts? Were not the ancient religions one and all sectional? The gods of Egypt were for the Egyptian and for no other man; the conquests of the Assyrian monarch glorified the deities of Assyria; and Greek religion was the property of none but Greek men. And not

every man who lived in Greece and spoke its tongue was Greek; nay, in a city like Athens the Greek was but one man in four. And to the slave the religion had no message, and he for it had no being. Even in Israel the Hebrew alone could worship Jehovah; the people who knew not the law were accursed. God might know them, but they did not know Him.

On the other hand, how is the Christian religion related to man? It knows no race, is confined to no class, but stands open to all. In the congregation, which to the man of art is but a vulgar multitude, what can the eye of insight see? Not faces or dresses, but souls; not manners, but men; not a multitude of impossibly perfect units, but a crowd of potential persons, an epitome of mankind. Here is an old man with all his ancient passions burnt out and become cold, dark ashes, asking pardon of a God to whom he can give nothing but dumb gratitude; and there is a woman who was yesterday a wife and to-day is a widow, seeking comfort for a sorrow time cannot heal. Here sits a merchant who a year since thought himself rich beyond the dreams of avarice, and now knows that he is poor in friends and penniless, lifting a sore heart to Him who can alone read his troubles; and there beside him sits a successful man who, born in poverty, now rolls in wealth and who needs the thought of the Eternal God to keep him humble and mindful of duty. Hidden in a dark corner is a guilty man who bears upon his soul the curse of the innocence he seduced; and near him is a tempted man who does not desire to fall, but feels himself too weak to stand. Full in the sunlight, with a voice too thick to be heard in praise, sits a husband who has become a father and feels as if he had passed through the very gates of death only to find all the sluices of hope and joy

open and pouring upon his soul their living waters. And not far off is a youth who a year ago left home a simple boy and has grown by temptation resisted into a purposeful man; a new-made mother who wishes to find a voice that shall express her inarticulate yet irrepressible gladness; an aged woman who has seen for no sin of hers the fruit of her body wither and die; a family of orphans who know not what they have lost; and a childless pair who once knew the sounds that make the parents' hearts glad and can know them no more. But who can see or tell all that a single congregation has to show? Man is there as he is before God, with all his infinite promise, his failures and achievements, his hopes and fears; woman is there with her loves and sorrows, her hopes that cannot be spoken, the faith that many waters cannot drown, the desire that disappointment is unable to extinguish. Time is there, though holding eternity within it; vice is there, seeking with tears the way back to virtue; there is the chastity that never blushed for shame, and the lust that is ashamed to blush; the world is there, and there God is to meet the world. Nay, what is a congregation but a splendid moment of crowded being, where all men are immortal and all may attain the beatific vision, where souls who have lost paradise struggle to regain it; and He who guards its gates at once woos and awes, invites and winnows, those who would enter. Who will say that anything grander in dream or reality ever came into the imagination of man than the vision which the most prosaic and commonplace congregation unrolls before him who has eyes to see? The things I have said I have seen; and he who knows living men will know that my testimony is true.

III

The Christian church, then, which has displaced the temple, whether Hebrew or heathen, may be defined as the spiritual home of the Christian man — where he was born, where rise and whence flow the springs of his higher life, and whither he comes to worship God and to realize his own manhood in and through the worship of Him. Hence comes the question, What is Christian worship? In what respects does it, as conducted by the congregation and within the church, bear a distinctive character?

1. Worship in its fundamental idea may be said to be the speech of God to man and of man to God. It is therefore a two-sided activity, expressing the reciprocal action of two consciously related beings, God and man. This idea is generic, common to all religions, whether they use a grove or a mosque, a temple or a church. Where the specific Christian elements appear is in the quality and character of the beings related, and therefore in the way man takes and the acts he does to please and adore God. Out of these differences grow the points which have now to be discussed.

2. In Christian worship a living man cries unto the living God, and the living God speaks responsively to the living man. Were God dumb and incapable of speech, man could not worship Him, for what communion can the living hold with the dead, or he who uses a language with him for whom no language is? Eternity is an impressive thought, but man cannot worship eternity, for how can he pray to that which has no ear to hear, no power to help? Immensity may embosom him, but how can he commune with a space that does not know him and has no heart to love? The deeper the impulses that move

man to worship, the more must the God he needs be alive. There is, as said Jeremy Taylor, in the old books of the Jews, a story concerning the call of Abraham, which illustrates man's need of a living God.* When Abraham first heard the voice of God and knew that the Eternal had spoken to him, he watched the great stars come out in heaven, and said, "These are He"; but they faded, and the patriarch thought, "They cannot be the Eternal, for He abideth always and fadeth never." Then the pale-faced moon climbed the sky, and he cried, "Lo! this orb so calm, so pure, so silvern and lovely, this, this is He." But the moon tarried not, for, shot out of the East, came the golden shafts of the sun, and he in his chariot of fire rode gloriously across the arch of heaven. He moved the patriarch to the admiration whose very breath is praise and whose soul is worship. But the sun hastened westward and died amid the red and radiant hues which the clouds caught from his face, leaving the sky to night and

* Let me here give "the story" which Jeremy Taylor introduces by the saying attributed to him in the text. It stands at the end of his *Liberty of Prophesying*. "'When Abraham sat at his tent-door, according to his custom, waiting to entertain strangers, he espied an old man stooping and leaning on his staff, weary with age and travail, coming towards him, who was a hundred years of age: he received him kindly, washed his feet, provided supper, caused him to sit down: but, observing that the old man eat and prayed not, nor begged for a blessing on his meat, he asked him why he did not worship the God of heaven. The old man told him that he worshipped the fire only, and acknowledged no other god. At which answer Abraham grew so zealously angry, that he thrust the old man out of his tent, and exposed him to all the evils of the night, and an unguarded condition. When the old man was gone, God called to Abraham, and asked him where the stranger was: he replied, 'I thrust him away because he did not worship thee.' God answered him, 'I have suffered him these hundred years, although he dishonoured me: and couldst not thou endure him one night, when he gave thee no trouble?' Upon this Abraham fetched him back again, and gave him hospitable entertainment and wise instruction.' Go thou and do likewise, and thy charity will be rewarded by the God of Abraham."

the earth to darkness. And Abraham said: "The Eternal is greater than these; He neither riseth nor setteth, for Him there is neither day nor night; He made all things, and is Himself unmade. Him only will I worship, for He alone lives." And other than a "living God" no man can worship; and where man feels his need and finds this God he can do no other than worship Him.

But the "living God" must govern; man seeks a God, but it is a Sovereign he finds. A deity that did not rule might be a fiction of Epicurean romance, but could not be the authority which men who adore must obey. We judge the mother unnatural who deserts her own offspring. What, then, would a God be who made a world and left it to wander unguided and unblest through space? But He who loves and rules must be good if we are to worship Him. Where no love is, no reverence can be; and goodness can alone evoke the love whose speech is worship. Hate may curse, fear may abhor, suspicion may dislike or even dread, indifference may become cynical, and the cynic easily changes into the sceptic; but from all these worship is remote. Where utmost need, and trust, and reverence, and admiration, and desire are bound together by an affection that will let no one of them go, there is the love whose life is worship and whose speech is adoration. And the one and the only Being who can evoke and satisfy all these at once is "the living God."

3. But there can be no object of worship without a subject or person who worships; and if God is the object, man is the subject. It is not indeed man empirical, clothed in the accidents of time and place, but man essential and universal, individuated, isolated, the man who stands face to face with God, just as if in all the universe there were only two persons, God and the soul. It is an awful and oppressive

thing to feel: "I am and God is; He may be gracious to me, but He is angry at the sins which I love, and I would fain escape from Him that I may dwell with my pleasures and my sins. But I cannot; for He besets me behind and before, and forces me to know that a being made to be a native of eternity must live as an alien in time."

Outside the church, what are we? Physicians, men who fight a noble battle against physical suffering, the causes that enfeeble, the diseases that kill; or lawyers, men who know the affairs and the souls of their clients, and advise with equal equanimity the knave who has come within the clutches of the law and the honest man whom the knave has deceived; or men of business, shrewd, calculating, well versed in the share list, in the ways of the ships on the sea, the cargoes they carry, the markets whence they have come and to which they go; or workmen, hard of hand, rheumatic of shoulder, wriggling in the grip of their union, or by its help wrestling with their masters for something more and better than a living wage; or mistresses weary with the ways of servants; or servants sick of the whims of mistresses; or seamstresses who have sewn with double thread the shirt and the shroud; or harassed shopwomen; or mothers deafened with the clamour of the children; or wives who yearn for the child that has not come. But inside the church, what are we? Souls, from whom time and its accidents, — rank, status, social dignity or the want of it, esteem or disesteem, — have all fallen away; and we stand robed in immortality, sinful and penitent or saintly and jubilant, before the eternal God. In the place where we worship we know neither poor man nor rich, neither master nor servant, neither lords nor commons, but only men; but to know men is to know infinitely more than all their

titles can signify, all their possessions or professions can represent. For it is all of us God cares to know and all in us that can know God. The Alps seen from below rear their heads crowned with unsullied snow into the eternal sunlight, and they look glorious and grand; but seen from above they lose their proud altitude, and fade into the common dark earth, which owes all the light in which it lives to the sun which shines in the heavens. And social distinctions may loom large to the eyes that look from without and beneath; but to him who sees with the eyes of God these distinctions perish, though the real man remains. For the presence of God levels all only that all may be dignified. Before Him the meanest becomes glorious as a bud of immortal being; and the most distinguished loses his social preëminence that he may enter through the gate of humility the kingdom of heaven. In a state without religion the social transcendence of some men may well become through the power it gives on the one hand, and the envy it creates on the other, a danger to society; but where the ideal of worship reigns, rich and poor meet together before the Lord, who is the maker of them all.

4. Let no man think that I write as a dreamer rather than as a seer. Let us consider the influence and action of six days of toil on the workman, or business worries, calculations, and cares on the merchant; civil distractions, political and party harassments on the statesman; domestic burdens and family anxieties on the mother; social dissipations, diversions, jealousies, and small ambitions, whose very fulfilment belittles and dissatisfies, on the people who constitute society; and would you say the influence is good and the action beneficent? This state of mind was what the older evangelicals termed *worldliness*. It was the mind for which there was no God, no conscience, no

duty, no truth, no ideal to be lived for, no hell to be avoided, no heaven to be won; for there was only riches to be gained, success to be achieved, a business to be pushed, a family to be maintained in dress and decorum. In the so-called upper classes it was love of dignity, place, power, recognition by royalty, and social leadership; in the so-termed middle classes it was comfort, prosperity, the full barn and the ample treasury, well-to-do-ness as the essence of well-being; and in the class we name lower it was greed for better wages, absorption in physical toil, love of brutal sports. In each class worldliness had certain characteristic forms, but its spirit was one and common to all. It was the passion to live as if there was no world but this; as if man was all body and no soul; as if there was no God but fashion or success or coarse amusements; as if there was nothing worth living for but gaiety or gain, work or sleep. Now what kind of men would this passion make? Brutal men, who loved their own happiness, and were careless as to the means of attaining it; greedy men, who loved gold, and did not mind what it cost to get it; lustful men, who never thought whether they had a soul to save or lose; frivolous women, who liked to be beautiful and did not care to be good. And out of such persons could moral men be made, or an ordered society, or a happy and contented state? Why —

> "Dragons of the prime,
> Who tear each other in the slime
> Make mellow music matched with men."

But take from us our worship, and what would remain save this mind and men such as these? Without the churches where should we have a force strong enough to break the chain of secular causes that binds our days together and prevents us resting our weary limbs from the dismal monotony of the treadmill, or lifting our eyes to see beyond

the prison walls the land that is very far off? Our very presence in a congregation is a confession of our belief in a higher world than this, where a nobler and more ideal order reigns, where souls realize their immortality and live in harmony with each other and with God. In worship we are lifted out of time into eternity, we listen to its voices, we speak to the Most High and hear Him speak to us. We lose the taint of the world, forget all social and servile distinctions, and become "fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God." As brothers we sing the same psalm and join in the common prayer; and though we may later in the public arena strive for the mastery, yet the memory of the hour we passed together before the throne of God can never wholly fade or allow either to appear to the other as common or unclean.

IV

But it is not enough to describe the God man worships and the man who worships God; it is quite as necessary to ask, What is worship? What special acts constitute it? We have seen that worship must be conceived as a reciprocal activity, the speech and action of man towards God as well as of God towards man. If either be dumb or irresponsive there can be no worship. Man cannot adore an indifferent or absent God; a living and a holy God can have no pleasure in a dead or in a wicked man.

1. We have to consider in what ways man can most appropriately worship. He addresses God in two forms, praise and prayer. Now these, so far as public, have one characteristic in common, each must be at once personal and peculiar, special to each several worshipper; and general or catholic, the act and deed of the congregation as a

whole. No man can worship God by proxy, whether by means of a hired representative who does it for money, or by means of a spiritual delegate who is qualified by his office and acts out of love. But if the worship is to be of the people as a whole, the person must be fused in the society; he must cease to be an individual, and merge his being in the larger unity. This double aspect, the personal and the collective, of man's part in worship must be always kept in view.

2. Praise must be personal yet collective, because expressive of the gratitude and adoration at once of the individual and of the multitude. What concern has the heart that knows neither joy nor affection nor admiration with song? But song is the natural speech of the happy and grateful spirit. And this means that no choir as a choir can praise God; no anthem as an anthem, however perfect the music to which it is set, can realize the ideal of worship; that is only possible to the people of God as His people. This does not mean that our praise is to be unmusical or discordant, is to be droned out or brayed forth without any attempt at harmony in the expression, or "linked sweetness" in the sounds. On the contrary, the more agreeable we can make it the more congregational it will become; the less it offends the most sensitive ear the better will it express the gratitude of the humblest heart. The soul will give it the note of conviction and sincerity which pleases Heaven; the congregation will give it the concord which is grateful to man. To secure this the organ and the choir may be alike necessary; but they are needful as helps to man, while it is the man himself who is needful to the praise of God. And if music is not to be despised as a factor of the tuneful concord which wins man to praise, neither is the psalm or hymn in which he attempts to express it. And here let me say, we ought

to be more jealous of the words we sing than of the music we sing them to. The two indeed are so related that sublime words demand sublime music for their interpretation; but the words are before the music, and speak a wider and more intelligible language.

The ancient Hebrew psalm is distinguished from the modern hymn by the greater space it gives to the majesty of God; the modern hymn is distinguished from the ancient psalm by the greater emphasis it lays on the emotions and the weaknesses, the loves and the despairs of man. The antithesis may be too absolute to be accurate in all the details it involves; yet it is roundly true. In the Hebrew Psalms there is much that is subjective, personal, petty, and vindictive; but the idea that stands in the foreground and gives character to all behind and around it is the sovereignty, the eternity, the all-sufficiency of God. In our modern Christian hymns a few have an exalted idea of the divine majesty, but the immense majority are more petty than sublime, are trivial, beautiful perhaps, but not practical, mirrors of a weary and sensuous rather than a strong and spiritual faith. I am grateful that my childhood was nurtured on the Book of Psalms rather than on the jingling verses that celebrate the "Sweet Saviour," or protest how I love "my Jesus." Well do I remember the old barn-like meeting-house to which I was taken as a child, and where I went as a boy, with its bare walls, its unpainted windows, its unstained, high-backed, square family pews; the long sermon, the hard, worn, furrowed faces, now, alas! all turned into dust; the low, stern grumble or high falsetto that then seemed the fittest voice for praise. But one memory to-day drowns and dwarfs all these, the sense that old congregation and those ancestors and kinsfolk of mine had for the majesty of God, and the reality to them

of the inspired Psalms to which they owed it. Their praise expressed their awe before the God in whom they believed, their gratitude for the salvation His grace had wrought, and their utter surrender of themselves to His will and guidance. And daily my prayer would be: let our praise speak a faith as strenuous and true as theirs in language as musical as our own; and our worship will be not unworthy of the acceptance of the God of our fathers.

3. Prayer is a more complex act than praise, for while as broadly congregational, it ought to be more deeply personal. In praise we exult in God — the love, the gratitude, the reverence, and the adoration within us break into the song whose words are winged by music; but in prayer we commune with God, plead with Him, show Him in confession our souls as we see them, that He may show them to us as He sees them. Praise mainly relates to what God has done; prayer to what we hope He may do. We ask from Him new mercies in order that the old mercies may not be in vain. Praise concerns the past, but prayer the present and the future. It is full, therefore, of the infinite needs of man. Could we listen with the ear of God to the cries, articulate and inarticulate, that daily rise from earth to heaven, we should know as we never knew before how God must pity to be just; how pathetic is the life of him who knows only a brief moment of being and knows neither the eternity behind nor the eternity before; how heart clings to heart and seeks nothing more from God than to be allowed to praise Him; how reluctantly men sin and how earnestly they beseech pardon.

And it is this intensely personal character of prayer that makes it at once so necessary to the man and so difficult to the congregation. The things man most needs from God he can least bear to ask in the hearing of men; the things

the whole congregation needs may meet the case of no single man. A book of Common Prayer does not overcome the difficulty, for though its language may be stately its range is limited, and the statelier the speech the less may it be able to restrain the passion or utter the desire of the heart.* And where prayer is free and the voice that utters the prayer but one, the congregation may feel as if it listened to a man praying rather than prayed with the man. For the prayer to be congregational, then, the minister must be the people, and the people must become the minister. There is music without words, and there is prayer without speech; for prayer is constituted not by the words used, but by the faith they express, and while the minister may find the words the congregation supply the faith. In prayer, then, the minister is the vicar of his people; he stands in their place and pleads in their name before God. He loses his personal being and becomes, as it were, a collective person. A whole people speaks through his voice, confesses sin, implores forgiveness, pleads for help, asks consolation, utters thanksgiving, beseeches God to be merciful to men ere they go hence and are no more. When the minister kneels morning and evening in his own study he may feel a miserable sinner with a self of his own which needs to be forgiven, directed, strengthened, enlightened; but when he prays amid his people his personal consciousness is dissolved or enlarged into theirs, and he becomes a voice, making their prayer articulate, confessing the sins that lie on their consciences, the enmities that slumber in their hearts, the sorrows that corrode their spirits, the graces that adorn and make beautiful their lives. And this means that what he, as we imagine him, feels all ought to feel; if a petition

* I have never, save once, heard free or spontaneous prayer criticized; and I have never forgotten the criticism: "The prayer was too literary."

be my brother's, it ought to be mine; if a confession be mine, it ought to be his. In Christian prayer the one is the all and the all is the one; the congregation is a man, the man is a whole congregation, with all its infinite needs and desires articulated before God. Were this ideal realized, what a sanctity would belong to the congregation, and what a sacred power to its act of worship!

V

1. Praise and prayer are man's acts, modes in which he speaks to God; but now what of God's speech to man? The divine response to human needs is as varied as the needs to which it responds; it is distilled in all the influences and distributed by all the agencies proper to the religion. The building as a creation of human faith, and the congregation as an assemblage of believing men, alike speak of God and the eternity which environs us. Every good man is like a vessel charged with divine grace. The schools where we try to train our children to godliness; the societies where we think of those whom man profanely terms the lower races as souls Christ died to save; the mission rooms where we seek to reach our unfortunates at home; the philanthropies we cultivate; the enthusiasms for justice and truth we labour to beget and foster — testify to a God who works without ceasing in man on behalf of men. Then the stated days on which and the purposes for which we assemble to seek God, to meditate on His truth, to hold the attitude of a disciple and to learn of Him, to listen with a susceptible ear to the voice too soft and still to be heard amid the din and clangour of our weekly toil — witness to the need which the living man feels for intercourse with the living God. And does not the experience

of the humblest and the proudest alike attest these facts: — that in the congregation dwell the influences that counteract the secular forces which beat upon us so fiercely during the week; that in worship are begotten the impulses which shape our common clay to nobler uses; and that when we meet God our horizon is widened till it becomes an immensity without limit, our mortal outlook lengthened into the eternity which is His home?

2. But these are all impersonal influences rather than personal speech; and did they stand alone, our worship would represent only the indirect benefits of our aspiration towards God, not the direct gain of His immediate converse with us. And a Deity who would not respond to our speech were, to use John Howe's word, "inconversible"; one who would make all our worship unreal and vain. The man who speaks to God in the name of the people ought also to be able to speak to the people in the name of God. It is here where the awful and solemn function of the sermon appears; it ought to come as the response of God to the cry of man, as the uprising of His light upon those who were sitting in darkness, half inclined to fear that the dawn might never come. It is profane as well as impertinent to describe what is termed the Eucharist as "the supreme act of Christian worship." What in days of deeper reverence and greater simplicity used to be called by an English name, the "Lord's Supper," is now denoted by a Greek one; and is, when said to be "an act of worship," placed where neither Christ nor His apostles* ever intended it to be. Augustine, with more

* Out of the six men who contribute canonical epistles which explain the doctrines of the religion of Christ, only one has anything to say touching the so-called Eucharist and its observances or ceremonies. He is, too, a man who wrote no gospel, and throws doubt upon his own personal knowledge of Jesus, which he calls knowing "Christ after the flesh" (Cor. v. 16).

genuine insight than any modern, termed the "Supper" a "visible word," a phrase which suggested the high doctrine of Calvin and the higher doctrine of Zwingli, and which expressed the truth that the rite was a "sacrament," but not a "sacrifice." Jesus neither thinks nor speaks in ritual; the very mysteries of the faith are expressed not in ceremonies men must observe, but in language they can comprehend. Hence He is spoken of and to as Rabbi,* with a royal, not with a priestly descent, which He claimed to be illustrated in His own historical person.† He is by preëminence the teacher and the preacher, and what He hath He gave. His command to His apostles was, "Go, preach the Gospel." That preaching has not been continuous; there have been great periods when men have been silent, not governed by the enthusiasm of speech; or when the enthusiasm has, as it were, been laid asleep and waited for a resurrection.

3. Yet out of preaching what has come? There came the apostolic churches that stood in the cities round the tideless Mediterranean. Out of preaching came the conversion of those great barbarian peoples who poured into Rome, and yet were made more Christian by so pouring. Out of it came those missions represented in the far north by Columba and the men of Iona, who gave their early character to the people of my land; out of it came Augustine of Canterbury, who came late to these Southern people and ought to have come earlier, bringing what was later in origin, and in nature different through long delay. Then there went from our islands away back to the Continent, Saxon, Scottish, and Irish preachers, creating

* Matt. xxvi. 49 (cf. Mark xiv. 45); Mark ix. 5, xi. 21; John i. 39, 50; iii. 2; iv. 31; xi. 8.

† Matt. xxii. 41–5; Mark xii. 35–9; cf. Matt. i. 20; Luke i. 27; ii. 4.

homes of light where darkness might have seemed to be. As a consequence there came the conversion of the Northern nations, achieved by preaching. And what was the Reformation except a resurrection of the ancient function of preaching? And what were the Reformers — men like Luther, Zwingli, Œcolampadius, Calvin, Beza — save preachers? Would not the enumeration of them be but the naming of men great in literature because great in speech? Was not the sermon, the appeal to reason and experience, its great instrument? and was not the counter-Reformation accomplished by the same great instrument? Could Richard Hooker have been the man he was, or have written his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, unless he had been a preacher, who had Travers to compete with, in the "spacious days of great Elizabeth"? Or without the *Golden Grove* would Jeremy Taylor have had a name fragrant in letters? Did not the sermon awake Richard Baxter and compel him to compose those sermons that seemed, in spite of their metaphysical subtlety and refinements, to his contemporaries so like "logic on fire"? Did not John Bunyan through hearing a preacher become our supreme allegorist in literature and history? Was not stately John Howe made by the appeals of "golden-mouthed" Stephen Marshall; and by the same agency three generations of Edmund Calamys, and simple-hearted and subtle-minded Isaac Watts? Were not the sermons of John Wesley and George Whitefield causes that helped to bring about the evangelical Revival; and is not their successor, John Henry Newman, better remembered as a preacher than as a celebrant? Great, therefore, is the power of the pulpit and of human speech, which here means the truth of God, though His truth as realized in the awed and reverent spirit of man.

4. I know I shall be pardoned one personal reminiscence.

Well, then, in the summer of 1894 I hurried away from Oxford to the land of

"brown heath and shaggy wood"

which lies to the north of Tweed, where I, at least, can breathe ancestral air such as was once breathed by men often dumb yet never silent. In the town of Oxford the British Association had met, and there had gathered the many illustrious men that make the name of England famous in science, together with distinguished men from many lands, who had come to mingle their discoveries with ours and to hear from us what discoveries we had made. Just a week after I had left Oxford and all its fame, and all its brilliance, I stood on a height which overlooked what is to me the loveliest spot on earth, for it is near my own childhood's home. In the distance there rose the grey back, crowned with a lion's head, of Arthur's Seat, and up from beyond it rose the smoke of the grey northern city, whose buildings upheaved their backs to heaven, and were —

Piled deep and massy, close and high,
Mine own romantic town.

Between me and the lion-crowned height ran a little stream, over which battle and feud had often flowed, and which had run red with good Scotch blood. Just behind me was the tower where, when they had captured him, they brought George Wishart on his way to the scaffold and death, one of the many martyrs which our people gave to the evangelical faith. On my right hand and a little behind me lay the small country town where, about 370 years since, a brawny, stalwart youth lived, studied, worked, planned, who was called of God and grew into a man of whom it was said, though not till he lay silent in death, that "he never feared man's face," who cast out

from amid his people a form of religion that had lost power to control men, and so had become mischievous; and created schools in every parish, planning also that high schools, which he described, should be in every considerable town. My people may have many a sin and weakness, yet, thanks to him, they are a people of whom it can be said they are at least educated and love education. On the other side of the Firth, beyond the radiant water, at the farther end of the land where it looks out into the North Sea, lies the quaint university town where the one famed son of the Renaissance our kingdom can boast, George Buchanan — though among his successors Andrew Melville stands, who runs him close — once held sway, and where in the same office the man reigned who, most of all, can be esteemed as the saintly man of our race, and where he died, just as Charles II came to the throne. When the summons came to him to appear before the monarch and his judges, the answer came — "I go to obey an earlier summons from a greater King." He, in his very death, felt that in the distant parish of his earliest ministry and love, Anwoth, if there lived but one soul, lost through him, then the thought of that loss would make heaven so great a misery that to leave it and come to earth, where he might emulate his Saviour and suffer and die for the lost, would be to him almost a joy. And northward and westward I could see the peaks of hills beneath which Portmoak lay, where a man called in his day Ebenezer Erskine once was minister, a brawny man and the father of a stalwart race, who helped to make the religion of Christ more of the power it is amid our people. Still farther to the north imagination could picture the braes of Abernethy, where John Brown had herded his sheep while he studied his Latin, and learned the Greek New Testament, which enabled

him even as boy to win eminence in learning and fame for his church, and the patience and tact which gained him later a professor's place. He became a father to many, and grew into a preacher so known and a scholar so famed that David Hume once said, infidel as he was, "I like that man, for he preaches as if he had Jesus Christ at his elbow." And on the same side of the water, just touching the Forth, washed by its waves, lay the town —if town it can be called— of Anstruther, where in the late years of the eighteenth century the muscular and masculine Thomas Chalmers laid up the health and strength that made him the reviver of the church in Scotland. And behind me, between me and the Lammermoors, nestled the little village, placid as ever, where Robert Moffat first saw the light of day, which still stands with us and for our people as the symbol of the preacher's work. Surely as the procession of names passed before me, did it not seem that what made the places beautiful were the persons they suggested, whose very names told that, not kings and nobles, but preachers had made my people; and that while Christ lived incorporated in such men and inspired them with the power of reforming and converting man, there was neither promise nor threat of decay on the part either of Him or His church.

5. Some conclusory words may now be written as to the sort of man who can best represent God to the people and the people before God. "Minister" stands opposed to "magister," as the little man who serves to the big man who commands, the "master" who possesses that he may communicate, and knows what he teaches. It may seem a paradox, and will so prove to many, though it is a mere truism to me to say, from the apotheosis of the church and sacraments has come the deterioration of the ministry; for we cannot magnify any office without minimizing the man-

hood of the persons who fill it. Man finds it easier to rely on the sacro-sanctities of office than on the eminence of character and the dignities of culture. And the man who has studied most does not stand in proud isolation or pre-eminence beside men, but walks humbly with his God. The preacher who stands in the succession of the prophet rather than the priest does not bear his burdens in his own strength; but is maintained in the exercise of his majestic functions by the feeling of his responsibilities to God and men. The minister is the servant of duty, not the slave of expediency; he looks at time and all that is within it through eternity, and he does not shrink from speaking to the souls entrusted to him the truth which is duty, and which God has spoken to those who listen for His voice.

We seem to have wandered far, though we have not, from the idea of a worship which is simply the communion of man with God and the correlative communion of God with man: but to realize this idea is in the long run dependent on the Being man worships. And God is not conceived here as a sort of Oriental potentate, who keeps man afar off, speaking to him mainly in symbols, who is pleased with our fragrant incense and gratified by our musical praise; but as the Father of spirits, a Being whose worship must be filial through and through. This He seeks; for it He made us, and in it He rejoices; for therein He attains the beatitude of the Father who loves to hear the voices of His children, to feel their small soft hands holding to His knees and clasping His feet. The God we worship loves to speak to us as men who fear lest they go astray, and daily pray that He may make the paths in which they cannot err straight for their feet. And we worship Him that we may be like Him, "perfect, as our Father in heaven is perfect."*

* Matt. v. 48.

II

JESUS AND THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH

THE founding of what Jesus termed the kingdom of God and we name the Christian religion begins with the calling of the disciples. With them and their education His ministry was concerned, and not with the conversion of a nation or a multitude. The people and the religious parties supplied the environment amid which He did the things He performed, the local conditions which enabled Him to point His morals and to bring out His truth; but His work, so far at least as represented by His life and teaching, was to construct a new environment for others than Himself, to elaborate a fresh personal and social ideal, and to form the men who were to realize it. If success be measured by the numbers attracted and influenced, — the work of Jesus must be described as a grotesque failure; but if by the degree or amount of power manifested, the quality of the men formed, the ends then and still sought and so far secured, — then we must judge His work to be of more splendid efficacy than anything ever attempted or achieved by any single person in history.

I

1. What sort of person Jesus was before the baptism and the preaching of John we do not certainly know, though we may infer. What we do know is that He suddenly

breaks silence and bursts into speech. Jesus "came into Galilee preaching the Gospel of God," * and called the fishermen to follow Him and be made into "fishers of men." † When He so came He was but a Jew, lowly born, humbly bred, a mere peasant without learning or culture, without the manners of the court or the spirit of the capital. He had become a preacher just as Amos the herdman of Tekoa had done; ‡ or as David, who had been taken from the sheepfolds "from following the ewes great with young," § and made a king. And like them, though His call was due to the direct action of God, yet He was despised and rejected by the official leaders of the people. Pascal || says: "Jesus Christ lived in an obscurity, at least in what the world calls obscurity, so deep that the historians, who write only of the great affairs of state, hardly notice Him." If they had noticed, what would they have said? Probably something like this: "In those days one Jesus of Nazareth, a carpenter, began to preach, and, after the manner of his kind, gathered round him certain ignorant fisher-folk; but all the people of repute held aloof. And when he became troublesome, the chief priest, by a stroke of most excellent diplomacy, had him captured and taken before the procurator, who soon made an end of the vain agitator." Happily eyes of truer and keener insight watched His coming, and so when He left us He had ceased to be a Jew, and become the Son of God, the Person who was to act upon Society as the recreative Truth, and the process by which He slowly penetrated the spirit of man. All God's great works are accomplished in silence. They are not done amid the rattle of drums and the blare of trumpets. Light as it travels to the eye utters

* Mark i. 14. † Mark i. 17; Matt. iv. 19.
‡ Amos i. 1. § Psalm xxviii. 70, 71.
|| *Pensées*, vol. ii, p. 325 (Ed. Faugère); iii. p. 227 (Ed. Brunschvigg).

no sound the ear can hear, and creation is a silent process. Nature rose under the Almighty hand without clang of hammers or clamour of crowds, or thunders that distract and disturb. And when Jesus came from God it was but fit that His coming should be lowly. The most common of all things is birth, though nothing is so strange and even wonderful as the child born; but the most marvellous of all births is the birth of Him whom Herod hated, and Rome did not care to know. And as the child came, so came the King. His kingdom was founded by humble words and lowly deeds, by a life lived amid His own people, at the side of His own sea, and in His own province of Galilee. When His work was done, and He had to go home to the Father, He went as silently as He had come. And though His time was short, His day was like an eternal now which can never fade from the eye of man or be swallowed up in the darkness of his night.

2. But our purpose is not to study the Primary Founder; but rather to study those who may be termed the secondary founders of our faith, persons without whom the religion could not have been. This distinction may seem indeed illusory, for the persons could only have become influential through and because of the activity of Jesus. We cannot isolate the two, and in studying the men He formed what are we doing except studying a special mode of His formative action? What this means will appear as we proceed; but here the first involves a second distinction. The secondary founders of the religion were of two classes, disciples and apostles The disciples were men of sympathetic minds, who responded to the spirit and teaching of Jesus; but the apostles were "the twelve," so named not because they typified the tribes of Israel, but because they were selected expressly to be made into "the

ministers of His word."* And how does one minister the word save by preaching? The disciples may be described as those who had an inarticulate affinity of spirit with Him and His aims; and who acted in obedience to a law which has reigned wherever man has had something to teach and men have felt anxious to learn. The disciples were, therefore, as men conscious of their own ignorance, compelled to seek a Master. The apostles, on the contrary, were selected and separated from this class by Jesus' own act, who wanted not mere hearers, but companions and successors; for, as Mark puts it, "He called unto Him whom He Himself would," and "He appointed twelve that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach."† This act was later and more conscious than the other, which was indeed less an act than what we may call a process of elective affinity, in which both He and they coöperated.

3. The method of education which Jesus followed may be described as threefold, by speech, by example, and by experience; or by what He said, by what He did, and by what He set them to do. He followed with disciples as well as with apostles this threefold method in the three periods into which His life naturally falls, and therefore with both the classes He attracted to His side. The first period is the opening of His public ministry, when He had around Him an indefinite number, now larger now smaller, of disciples. In this period His spirit was buoyant, cheerful, expectant, and breathed a serene and lucid hopefulness. He believed that truth, like God, is almighty; that where it leads man must follow; and that it has but to be known to be revered and loved and obeyed. But time brought dis-

* Matt. x. 2–7; xix. 28; Mark iii. 14–19; Luke vi. 13; xxii. 30.
† Mark iii. 13, 14.

illusionment; He discovered that men were creatures compacted of many interests and strong passions, which pulled them in opposite directions, and did not always allow them to go whither their faces pointed; and that it was possible to love controversy more than truth, and the quest after God more than the God the quest was pursued to find. And so the ministry which opened amid radiance, and with infinite promise, closed under tragedy and eclipse; and the pathos of the contrast between the radiant hope and the tragic eclipse lies in the apostasy of the many who had wished and professed to be disciples; but who could not pay the price or make the renunciation required from the men who would "walk with Jesus."

4. In the second period, which may be called the period of apostolic education, Jesus chooses from among the sympathetic but unstable disciples twelve men to be with Him and learn of Him, though here again He found that they were at once slow to believe what they did not wish to be true, and swift to credit what they desired, even if it were false. But where men are faithless He continues faithful, and here He had His reward. The apostles grow liker Him than they seem — the one apostasy which occurs amid the twelve only emphasizes the otherwise universal obedience — their apprehension of His truth grows, and though they often stumble, and almost as often fall, yet they begin to learn to walk alone, and trust where they cannot see.

The first and second periods are mainly Galilean, and its conflict is with the Pharisees, who are stronger in the provinces than even in the capital. In the third period the scene changes, and the teaching with it; Jerusalem takes the place of Galilee, the Sadducees become His antagonists, and the priests speak against Him rather than the scribes.

This means that in Jerusalem Jesus finds the most significant thing for religion to be not the synagogue and the law, but the temple so far as it regulates worship and conduct; and so He now speaks to the Sadducees concerning sacrifice and worship, and not, as in Galilee, to the Pharisees of obedience and conduct. The Sadducees, who as priests were more jealous of Him and more fearful of Rome which they knew than the Pharisees who did not know it, plot and accomplish His death. Its instrument is the cross, which thus becomes for the new religion a symbol of sacrifice, in room of the place of sacrifice in the temple which distinguished the old faith. But His death turned their fancied triumph into absolute defeat, for it is in the right and by the power of His cross that Christ, in His turn the symbol of the pity and the mercy of God, has ruled the world. Amid these scenes the education of the twelve is completed, the wisdom of Jesus in selecting them justified, and His sovereignty over man established.

II

1. In what we may name the discipular period, in distinction from the second or apostolic, let us imagine the men who as disciples were drawn to Jesus and drew Him to them. He and they were a signal illustration of elective affinities. They had with Him and He with them a sympathy which made the process of unconscious selection easy as well as natural. Here, then, is our first question, and many have found that it both suggests and expresses an initial difficulty: Why were the disciples of Jesus drawn in the first instance from the poor, who were here also the unlettered? Poverty was not in Israel the invariable associate of ignorance, though Jesus helped to make

it this. Does it not seem, then, as if there was truth in the ancient charge that it was because of the affinity of His own untutored nature for the natures and the ideals of the uneducated? He, as a man without learning, was attracted to the unlearned, and could not attract any of the learned either to Himself or to His cause. Now let us at once grant that there were educated classes in Israel, not necessarily moneyed men, but men qualified by culture to understand a real and genuine Messiah, and to enter with intelligence and enthusiasm into His aims and mind. Yet it is certain that Jesus neither drew such men nor was drawn to them. And it does not seem as if He had made any serious or sustained effort to attract them to His side. Why? Was it for reasons in Him or in them? Were the hindrances in His lack of culture or in the cultured classes themselves? This, then, is the question we have to discuss.

2. Our discussion starts, then, with the educated class of largest if not social yet political importance in Israel, viz. the priesthood. No priest became a disciple of Jesus; the priestly class as a whole, especially as represented by its responsible leaders, remained His irreconcilable enemies. This is a tragic fact; for the ideal of the priesthood was noble, if not indeed sublime; its temper had been fine and generous, though its traditions were regal and aristocratic. The priest in Israel filled the highest office possible to man. As thought fancied him, he was the mediator between man and God, with consequent responsibilities and correlative obligations, though he himself tended to forget both. As he looked towards man, he was like the visible image of God turned outward, with face and eyes so full of human pity, a heart so possessed of divine love, a conscience so instinct with eternal rectitude, that men would feel that in seeing him they

saw God; and found Him to be a Being so awful yet so attractive that the sinner, when he saw, ceased from his sinning, and the saint, who knew where the sinner could but see, lived as in the presence of the Eternal Purity. When the priest turned towards God he was meant to be as if he were collective Israel turned inward, or like man alone before God, with his incorporated sins and sorrows, penances and fears, prayers and praises, aspirations and hopes, making intercession with groanings which could not be uttered.

3. And, in history, the reality had in a measure corresponded to the ideal. The priesthood in Israel had stood through centuries in a ceaseless succession before God. The oil that anointed Aaron had consecrated all his sons; its fragrance had filled their generations. For the inheritance of venerable traditions, the memory of an illustrious past, the names of distinguished ancestors, and of heroic services to the people — all were theirs. Priests had crowned kings, and stood before them as counsellors and guides; they had suffered wasting and reproach with the people of God; had gone with them and for them into exile; together they had sat by the rivers of Babel, weeping as they remembered Zion. They had cheered the exiles with brave speech, high hopes, splendid pictures of their revived and rejuvenated race; and they had led the return to their ancient and holy but desolate home, where they had built a second temple, which seemed to the outward eye less glorious than Solomon's, though it was more glorious to the inward eye. For Solomon's spoke more of his own regal magnificence than of the majesty of God; but the temple which succeeded spoke of a faith that many waters could not quench; a piety that poverty could not extinguish; and a courage that,

out of the poverty and in the face of the oppressor, could build a home for the God who had chosen them out of all the families of the earth to be His people, and to be great through His name. And in days when the Gentiles were strong and the heathen ruled in the land, had not a priest proved himself more kingly than the king? and had not the Maccabæan name come to be feared beyond Israel, while loved within it as the symbol of heroic sagacity, strength, and patriotism?

4. But in the days of Jesus the priesthood, forgetful of its high vocation, had descended into the arena where craft contended against power, and by intrigue, by diplomacy, by supple astuteness where it confronted strength, by arrogance where it faced humility, had attempted to balance itself amid hostile forces, and to stand secure between the might of the Roman Empire and the turbulent Jewish democracy. The distance between Judas the Maccabæan and the adroit Caiaphas, or between Jonathan and Simon, the brothers of Judas and Annas, the high priest, with John and Alexander, and all his kindred — is greater than thought can measure. Enough to say, we could not conceive Caiaphas playing the part of the Maccabæan men, or the Maccabæan man giving to contemporary Israel a counsel like his, to surrender, say, to Antiochus Epiphanes the most blameless person they knew, in order that they themselves might be spared. It is small wonder that men who were, amid the collision of hostile political forces, so intent on maintaining their unstable equilibrium, should not know the Christ when He came, but should see in Him only One who endangered their office and threatened to overthrow their power. And so we are not surprised that Jesus was not drawn to any priest nor drew any priest to Himself.

On the contrary, we should have been astonished if He had found among the men who had, by being false to their own high vocation, become false through and through. For how could men vacant of good have affinities with Him so strong as to justify adoption into the band of His disciples?

5. But this defines only one side of the priestly incapacity; on another side the incapacity was still more inveterate. There is nothing that may be more accurately described as the man himself than the nature which is his both by inheritance and education. And the priesthood in Israel was at once hereditary and disciplined; it was an aristocracy both of blood and of office; its men were born to be priests, and what their birth made them they were trained to be. Now it is easier to change the skin of an Ethiopian than the soul of a man; and even in the renewed soul the old nature will out. And this means here that it is less difficult for the man born a priest to change his religion than to forget his priesthood. But in the kingdom which Jesus founded there were to be no priests; His religion was to be personal and ethical, not ceremonial and sacerdotal. He studiously avoided whatever looked towards the celebrations which the priest loves, and which so readily become to him the centre and substance of worship. Jesus followed no ritual, presented no sacrifice, did not frequent the temple, asked help of no priest, nor regarded one as needful for man's approach to God or God's approach to man. It was thus in entire consonance with His ideas that He invited no priest to become a disciple; and there is nothing more significant of His attitude of mind and the purpose that governed Him. For the man who conceived God to be jealous about the descent of the men who approached Him; about the forms they used, the altars they stood at, and

how they stood at the altars; about the beasts they touched or slew, the blood they sprinkled and how they did the sprinkling, — were men distasteful to Jesus. They held an idea of religion which rested on a conception of God that must have seemed mean and unworthy to Him whose soul lived in the Father and His love. And so He and they stood too far apart ever to meet. The birth and culture the priest had built round him was like a bulwark which Jesus could neither climb nor pierce; while the official minister of worship, the creation of the Levitical law, could not understand Christ's spirit of grace and truth.

III

1. But the Scribes and Pharisees constituted a second cultivated class, who may here be termed the men of tradition and the law, or the Book and its interpretation. The Pharisee did not, like the priest, base his claims on birth and blood, but on school and learning. He was not so sectional and aristocratic, but more national and democratic than the Sadducee. He might be poor, a humble trader or craftsman, for his fame did not rest on his worldly circumstances or success, but on his knowledge of the Fathers, on "the traditions of the elders," on the law, written or oral. The centre of his interest was the school and the synagogue, not the temple; he believed more in the Messiah and the hope of Israel than in the priest and his worship; the object of his veneration was the Book and not the altar.

2. Yet the Pharisees could boast a long and honourable history; they had built themselves an everlasting monument in the faith and literature and learning of Israel. They had gathered scholars in their schools, and by their preaching in the synagogue had instructed the people in the Ancient

Law. They had collected the sacred books, had woven into a connected and ordered history the older narratives, had preserved the fugitive psalms, the prophetic broadsides, the rhapsodies of nameless poets, and the reflections of unknown thinkers. These fragments they had piously pieced together, and had formed the canon of the Old Testament which Christianity knows, and we have inherited. We hold the wondrous Book in the deepest reverence, we study its history, are enlightened by its wisdom, uplifted by its poetry, informed, guided, cast down, strengthened by its prophecy; and we are duly grateful to the God who gave it and to the men through whom it came. The Bible is at once a library and a literature. It seems to us a single Book, yet it belongs to many ages, has a multitude of authors, and is the joint product of all the literary classes and all the literary men of an ancient people whose historical life is to be counted by centuries. And have not the scribes who created the marvellous literary unity we think of as our Bible a singular claim on our regard and even on our reverence? They had lived for the Word of God, had loved it, and had tried to keep it living by applying it to the daily life of their State and people. But now comes the tragedy which lies in all great deeds; the men grew to think of the Book as if they owned it, and as if it were a body of rules which they and their fathers had framed and enacted and ought to enforce, whether upon man or God; nor could they conceive any way to be His way save the law which they had established. And this law as of God could not be relaxed even in His favour whose law it was; it bound Him as well as man; He could not be permitted to be better or to do more or other than the law said. And so they could not think of Jesus as bringing a larger

and richer notion of God than either they or their fathers had known. They interpreted them as they interpreted Christ, through their rigorous statutes, and would not allow Him, unrebuked, to heal a cripple on the Sabbath,* or to say to a paralytic, who was also a penitent, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," † or to show His Messiahship by knowing no class save the men who needed to be saved. If He sought, by revealing His own kinship and feeling, to save the men, the Pharisees, who saw only the outside, whether of cup or platter, sepulchre or man, law or worship, never perceived the publican changed, or knew Him who changed him, and could only say, "Behold a man, gluttonous and a winebibber, the friend of publicans and sinners!" ‡

3. But our point may be illustrated by a most characteristic incident which Luke § tells. A Pharisee had been liberal enough to invite Jesus to eat with him. As the guests sat at meat in the rich man's house, the door, being open, in the Oriental fashion, the voices not only filled the room where they were sitting, but wandered out into the street. In the crowd that gathered was "a woman in the city, a sinner" whose heart the Lord had touched. Over her His voice threw its mystic spell, and drew her in, where she could better hear His gracious words. Behind Him, as he reclined, stretched His unsandalled feet, down her shoulders fell her untended hair, once her chief adornment and pride, now in the rush of the new penitence forgotten and neglected. As she strained forward to catch His gentle speech a tear stole down her cheek, and fell upon His naked feet. She started to see it there, for she felt as if the tears

* Matt. xii. 9–13; Mark iii. 1–5; Luke vi. 6–11.
† Mark ii. 3–12; Matt. ix. 2–8.
‡ Matt. xi. 16–19; Luke vii. 31–5; xv. 1, 2.
§ vii. 36–50.

shed by her sinful eyes would stain His unstained feet, and so she seized one of her sumptuous but forlorn locks to wipe her guilty tear from His sinless foot. But the Pharisee, who saw only the outward act, and neither the love in the Saviour nor the gratitude in the woman that prompted the deed, could only straighten and stiffen himself, and say: "This man, who so loves the sinner, must also love the sin she stands for; this woman, who so loves the man, proves Him to be as sinful as she; neither, therefore, is in place in my house." But Jesus answered Simon's unuttered thought by a parable which he was too shallow and impure to understand; and He pointed its moral by a saying which Simon could not comprehend. "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much." Where love is, it speaks a language intelligible to those who love; where love is not, its highest wisdom will appear to the loveless base passion or merest folly. How, then, could men so incapable of being just to the pity of God or the grace of Heaven, learn of Jesus? They could find no promise in Him, nor He any prophecy of possible culture in them. And so neither desired the other; the one could not be the Master nor the others be disciples. He turned to call the publican and sinner to repentance. But the Scribes and Pharisees looked and thought and lived as men who had no need to repent.

IV

1. Jesus, then, did not seek in Jerusalem and its temple, or among the scribes and their synagogues, for the men He needed. A disciple was a man who could learn of Him, who was no superior person, though he had a superior nature, not indeed as yet cultivated, only capable of

cultivation. The main matter was the quality not of the culture, but of the nature, for on the nature the kind and the quality of the culture will depend. Now, it was beside the inland sea of His own province that He found natures of a quality that could bear and repay cultivation at His hands. There in the eventide we might have seen the men launching their boats and faring forth upon the waters, or at night out on the lake, under the lustrous Syrian stars, or labouring at the oar and casting their nets into the sea, often to draw them in almost or even altogether empty. And, as the daylight broke and life in the villages began to stir, we might have seen the hardy fishermen, soiled and rough from their labours, come bearing the harvest, white and silvery and beautiful, they had reaped from the bosom of the lake to sell for food to men. Then by day we might have seen them, with their boats drawn up on the beach, sitting in their shadow mending their nets; while within the women kept household, and about the children played. There Jesus came, and there He found the men who had the possibilities of His disciples, and who could be made into "fishers of men."

2. And they were men who had within them a whole inarticulate world passionate for birth, ideals they could not utter or even comprehend. We can all feel the pathos of the dumb multitude, who have never known the splendid moment when a long enforced silence breaks into triumphant speech. Song is but the jubilant utterance of a nature which could not otherwise express the thoughts that arise within it; and art may follow after, though she can never overtake the nature that then learns to sing. Jesus had listened to the mute music within the men, and He gave them the voice they had been all through the silent centuries struggling to find. He saw in them, though they could

boast no famed ancestors and no glorious past, the promise of a fruitful future. They had upon them the infinite pathos of the nameless. From time immemorial their children had stolen out of eternity into time; and while the son had known his father, and probably his grandfather — perhaps in rare cases may even have seen or heard of his grandfather's father — yet beyond this point stretched the innumerable multitude of the nameless, the long receding line of the unknown. To the men who have had no past what promise can the future make, save that it must be as the past has been? The peasant may be known to his son and even to his son's son, but oblivion then overtakes him, eternity swallows him up; and he becomes a forgotten link in the generations, one moment known as a man, then unknown for ever. There amid the nameless, with all their possibilities lying ingloriously dumb within them, the Master found the men He needed, and called them to be His disciples.

3. It may frankly be said that the men were incapable of the culture of the school, and did not even try to acquire it. The scholar imitates classical models, and speaks in the language of letters and learning; the schoolman copies his pedagogue, and uses the tongue of his sect or his set. But the secondary founders of our faith never tried to become scholars or pedagogues or men of letters; they were and remained provincials, unmoved by the ambition to speak the tongue of Greece in the Athenian way, to understand either the law or the imperial politics and personalities of Rome. They were simply men who believed that the greatest thing in time was religion; that the highest Being man could know was God; and that the wisest thing he could do was to learn of him who knew most of God and could best teach His truth. And so they were as docile and ductile as

children, though they could also be as obstinate. They were passionate and petulant, frank but slow of speech, quick in action but sluggish in reason, swift to ask, with the simplicity of a child, questions that puzzle a man, impatient to get yet easily pleased with an answer. They were readily provoked yet not difficult to appease, unimpressed by the ideal, though struck by the exceptional which appealed to their wonder or their senses; they had a native incoherence of mind, yet were unsophisticated, transparent, honest as the day, with the hunger of spirit which craved for the realities hidden by the conventions of the time. Who they were we know but in part; to name and enumerate them all were indeed impossible. The apostles were all disciples, but not all the disciples were or became apostles. Four classes may be distinguished: (α) those who were chosen to form the twelve, to be the constant and intimate companions of the Master; (β) the faithful, like the women who followed Him to the cross and could not forget Him as He lay in the tomb; (γ) the multitudes of the like-minded who loved to hear the "gracious words that proceeded out of His mouth"; (δ) the occasional hearers, men who sympathized with Him, who loved Him, but who so loved the world that they feared to make the great renunciation He demanded. The disciples must, indeed, have been a mixed multitude. We may wish to know more of Martha and Mary and their brother Lazarus;* of the seventy who "returned with joy," saying, "Lord, even the devils are subject to us in Thy name";† of the Samaritan leper who alone of the ten who were healed turned back to thank Jesus and to glorify God;‡ of the young man who followed Jesus as

* Luke x. 38–42; John xi. 5. † Luke x. 17.
‡ *Ibid.*, xvii. 12–17.

they took Him from Gethsemane to the house of the high priest, and who "fled naked," leaving the linen cloth he had cast about him in his would-be captors' hands,* and of many more besides; but our wish is vain. All we can do is to think of the unknown in terms of the known. The men we know best are those who have apostolic names. They are all Galileans save one, Judas, the man from Kerioth, "which also betrayed Him." † He is a tragic figure, a Satan among those sons of God, possibly becoming a disciple in a fit of transient enthusiasm and admiration, discovering his awful mistake when it was too late, bearing the conflict between his actual mind and his ideal of Jesus till he could bear it no longer, and he "betrays his Master with a kiss." Two have Greek names, Andrew and Philip,‡ and they are the two who bring the Greeks to Jesus.§ The others have all Aramaic or Hebrew names,|| even Simon Bar-Jonah, receiving from the Master another and more characteristic name in the same tongue, Cephas, which later interpreters translated into the Greek Peter. But though the men agreed in descent, they differed in character. Some were like Levi or Matthew, the publican, who farmed the taxes which the Roman levied and was hated of all honest Jews, partly because of his profession and partly because of his subservience to the hated alien; and some were like Simon, who is described by Matthew and Mark as "the Cananæan," which is translated by Luke into Ζηλωτής: ¶ Simon, the Zealot, a member of a fanatical sect which despised the Roman, hated his taxes and regarded the publican as the Jewish instrument of his rapacity,

* Mark xiv. 51, 52.
† Matt. x. 4; xxvi. 25; xxvii. 31; Mark iii. 19; Luke vi. 16; xxii. 3, 48.
‡ Mark iii. 18.
§ John xii. 20–22. || Matt. x. 2–4; Mark iii. 16–19.
¶ Matt. x. 4; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13.

with a passion fiercely blended of contempt and scorn. But the majority were fishermen, who at the call of Jesus "forsook their nets and followed Him."

V

If we would more intimately know what manner of men the disciples were, let us study the two, Peter and John, who became most eminent as apostles, as they were when Jesus found them.

1. Peter comes to us straight from his nets, brawny and bronzed, with the smell of fish in his garment, and the light of the sea in his eyes, a child of nature, though of nature as Galilee knew it and as the Old Testament had made it. He knows the lake where he plies his craft, the currents that shoot through its bosom, and the banks where fish like to feed and breed and swim. He has by long watching become familiar with the seasons and the changes they effect in the air and the sea; with the moon and the stars which help him to steer his course by night and to know where he is, in spite of the shifting winds and the drifting clouds. But of what lies outside Galilee and beyond its lake he knows little. Jerusalem he has heard of and may even have visited; but Rome he does not know; with Athens he is quite unacquainted and can tell nothing of its potent schools. He has the narrow horizon and swift emotions, the limited but intense beliefs, of the fisherman. He is at once ignorant and arrogant, and thinks that by shaping the men he knows according to his own ideas he could make a happy society. He has the fine confidence in himself which enables him to assume the leadership of his companions and to speak for them; but when this self-confidence fails it fails utterly,

and he falls straightway into the deepest despair. Hence he now abases himself before Jesus as "a sinful man,"* and then he tells Him what He ought and what He ought not to do, and what all men say of Him † thinking within himself and saying even to his friends things that speak of defeat or disaster.‡ He will not allow the Lord to wash his feet till he understands the symbolism of the act; then he would be wholly washed that he might be wholly cleansed.§ He refuses to desert Him from whom he has learned the words of "eternal life," || and he has the courage in the face of an armed multitude to smite the servant of the chief priest.¶ But in spite of his own proud boast,** he so winces at the sneer of a Jewish maid as to forswear his Master.†† The man has a manhood unspoiled and unformed; he is inchoate and forward, free of speech, swift to judge or misjudge, with a nature liable to gusts as sudden and violent as those that swept down upon the face of his lake and lashed it into storm. This is all we can say Peter was when Jesus found him.

2. John, in the gospel which bears his name, appears as a more completely idealized man, distinguished as the specially "beloved disciple." We imagine him less toil-worn than Peter, with radiant face and unfurrowed brow, and something of a woman's grace in the lithe and boyish beauty of his figure, the sort of lad after whom a matron would look, admiration mingling with affection in her eyes, and say: "Blessed is the mother that bare thee." But, if we qualify the picture of John in the Fourth Gospel by traits drawn from the Synoptists, we may see the man as

* Luke v. 8.
† Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20; Matt. xvi. 16.
‡ Matt. xvi. 22.
§ John xiii. 6–10.
|| *Ibid.*, vi. 68.
¶ Matt. xxvi. 51.
** Matt. xxvi. 35; Mark xiv. 31.
†† Matt. xxvi. 69–75; Mark xiv. 66–72; Luke xxii. 56–62.

he really was when called to be an apostle. He has a hot and vindictive temper, such as we expect in a nature uncurbed and uncalmed, for when an inhospitable Samaritan village refused to receive Jesus because His face was set as though He would go to Jerusalem, John, oblivious of all in the conduct of the Jew that justified Samaritan dislike, asked that he should be allowed to command "fire to descend from heaven and consume them."* His temper had all the jealous intolerance of the ignorant who regard good done in a way, and by men they do not approve, as no better than evil, and so when he saw a man he did not know as a disciple casting out devils in the name of Jesus he forbade him. The man did not "follow with us," so had no right to know our truth or to use Christ's name. So John thought, and, expressing his thought, gave Jesus the opportunity to teach him the much-needed lesson: "He that is not against you is for you." † But John was then as vain as he was ignorant, and as ambitious as he was vain, and so he was blind both to his own frailties and to the majesty of the Redeemer, whose throne he and his brother thought they could climb to and were worthy to share. And he had not only the large ambitions of ignorant vanity, but he knew so little of what the passion and the death signified that when asked, as a condition of the favour he sought being granted, whether he could drink the Saviour's cup and be baptized with His baptism, he replied "he was able." ‡ Nothing could have caused more suffering to Jesus than a reply of this sort from a man like John, whose words here were more presumptuous than anything recorded of Peter. But there is a point where folly becomes too impertinent to wound the wise.

* Luke ix. 54. † Luke ix. 49, 50; Mark ix. 38–40.
‡ Matt. xx. 20–28; Mark x. 35–41.

3. These, then, are types of the men Jesus called and out of such stuff — the class of the neglected, if not the castaway — He made at once the founders and the foundation of His church. It is enough that the fact be here indicated, where it is impossible to emphasize its significance. But if he who makes a blade of grass to grow where none grew before, is a benefactor of his kind, what can be said of Him who makes not only good citizens out of neglected men, but turns them into potent and efficient servants of the race? One thing may here be noted, for it denotes a danger avoided as well as a feat achieved. Men say "the common people are prone to fanaticism"; for they admire and cultivate the intense passion for small things which we call by that unkindly name. But the disciples were enthusiasts rather than fanatics, possessed and inspired of God, not mere zealots of the fane, the place where and the forms in which men think He can alone be worshipped. Fanaticism is zeal for trifles; enthusiasm is zeal for things that matter. Fanaticism is external devotion to a ceremony or rite, things that may flourish unnoticed and die when observed; but enthusiasm is ethical and spiritual, the concentration of the soul on what promotes human happiness. Fanaticism guards the ornaments of the altar, the raiment that makes a man a wonder before and picturesque behind; but enthusiasm thinks of Him in whose honour the altar is built, and seeks to create within the actual man one inner and ideal. Fanaticism watches the city and keeps it sacred; enthusiasm is not inspired by place, but by religion which it loves, for the beatitude it promises. The priests at Jerusalem were, alike in what they loved and in what they hated, fanatics; but the Galilean men they despised were, as inspired to philanthropy by the beneficence of God, enthusiasts. Hence the

priests had the fury of the sectary for the temple, its ministers and its services; the apostles had the passion which is best described as the enthusiasm for humanity, for it burns to translate the grace of God into the good of man. Fanaticism is parsimonious, and will not part with what seems the very secret of its strength; but enthusiasm is distributive, for it lives by spending what it holds most dear.

Jesus, then, created out of common men the apostolical enthusiasts whom He laid as the basis of His church, and who were willing either to live or to die for man; but those He neither could nor did form were the fanatics who lost the city they would have died to save, and, indeed, who died in the attempt to save it.

III

THE MAKING OF THE CHURCH

I

1. WE are concerned at present with the accidents and antitheses of the teaching of Jesus, or the inter-relations between Christ and the men He called. We assume that He appears not as priest, but as prophet, as a new rabbi in Israel; a great man, raised up of God to teach the people.* We attempt no minute and exhaustive analysis of the instruction He gave. What we need to do is but to hear as the disciples heard, with the local colour restored and Jesus living before our eyes as He lived before theirs, embodying in character and conduct the ideal His teaching articulated. For the tone and colour of the teaching are local, determined by the province where it was spoken. What it preserves is not so much the ethics of Jesus as His antithesis to the Judaism of His day. The Judaism of Galilee was more national and less individual than the Judaism of the dispersion; more an ideal which was less in touch with reality than the Judaism of Jerusalem. The Judaism He confronted was more Pharisaic than Sadducean, had its seat in the synagogue and the school rather than the temple; its representatives were not the priests, but the scribes of the Pharisees. Now their Judaism was marked by the intensity of its Messianic hope,

* John iii. 2; i. 38–49; xx. 16; Matt. xxiii. 7, 8.

or its belief in the kingdom of heaven; its passion for separation; its faith that the kingdom could only be realized under the forms and within the limits of Judaism; its conviction that the law, which was conceived as of perpetual obligation, must be maintained in its severe purity, and enforced in its completest integrity. And their law was not so much sacerdotal and sacrificial as moral and ceremonial, was more concerned with the regulation of conduct than with an institution or method of worship, less Levitical than Mosaic.

2. This was essentially the Pharisaic notion of the law; and though all the scribes were not Pharisees, it was their notion also. They were, therefore, not so much moralists as jurists; their religion was a system of jurisprudence, or a legal and civil institution, rather than the relation of a moral man to a moral Deity. Their state was more a creation of positive legislation than a society of men freely associated for the better ordering of the collective and the individual life. To this system two things were necessary: (*α*) the synagogue where men met to do God honour by hearing the law they were bound to obey, read; and (*β*) the school where the scribe interpreted the law which he enforced and enlarged by his interpretations. To the law Galilee offered a free and fair field; for in Galilee the priesthood had hardly any foothold; neither they nor their Levitical law could flourish apart from the temple, which was their home. In Galilee, too, the Jews were not, as in the Greek or Roman cities, a small and feeble colony who might cherish but could not hope to realize their racial ideals. The population was mixed, but the Jew was a genuine dweller in the land and no mere stranger. This Pharisaic system, then, Jesus opposed, not as a theory of ethics, but as a religion which had tried to become tribal —

but could not succeed in becoming what it wanted to be — and He opposed it by setting over against the tribal Deity and His outward service a God who was the universal Father, and an obedience which was the inward service of all He loved.

II

1. The earlier teaching of Jesus is addressed to men in whom His preaching had created the initial condition of discipleship — faith, and the hope which is at once remote from doubt and akin to it; remote inasmuch as it expects to find, akin inasmuch as it fears that what it desires may prove illusory. What we have, then, in the so-called Sermon on the Mount is not a discourse inaugurative of the ministry, nor a programme of the religion, but a series of answers to unuttered interrogations. Jesus had preached "the Gospel of the kingdom," and "the kingdom" is what He seeks to explain, though under forms suggested by the questions which troubled the most sympathetic minds.

2. Jesus speaks, then, as a teacher to the simple but puzzled men who hear on the hillside, under the pure and open heaven and above the changeful, yet restful lake. What He says breathes the freshness of the spring morning, and, like it, is full of the fragrance of flowers and the songs of birds; while His words have the same open richness which Nature, in the hour of her awakening, wears to the soul which has just stolen out of the arms of blissful sleep. On His spirit there lay as yet no shadow of the cross; only a radiant brightness, which was all the more beautiful that it seemed subdued by the sorrow born of fellowship with man. Around lay the world of men, great, active, absorbed in political dreams and large ambitions.

Away up at Jerusalem the priests were celebrating in stately attire — amid chant, and song, and incense — the sacrifices which they thought guarded the approaches to God, and distributed His beneficences among men. Up there, too, as well as in many a provincial city, the scribes in their synagogues read and expounded "the Law." In Athens philosophers, seeking some new thing, waited for every stranger who came that they might question him; while they dreamed that the wisdom of the Greek race was the wisdom the world most needed for its higher life. In Corinth, in Alexandria, or in Antioch, rich merchants speculated on the Exchange, basing their speculations on the hunger of Rome, or the room for grain in the ships carrying it, and on how such ships could be sent emptier than the hungry people demanded, in order that prices might be enhanced. In the Rome on whose hunger they thus speculated Cæsar dwelt in his palace or drove in the amphitheatre, or listened to the foolish and gay, while he fancied that the world had in him the only master it needed. Unmindful of all these persons and places, with all their questions and wants, Jesus, still clothed as a peasant, addressed His simple folk in simple speech; yet with the dignity that came from nature and that owed nothing to art. The wisdom of His years of silence is seen in the maturity of His earliest recorded words, which are those not of a pupil who has much to learn, but of a master who has come to teach. And the men who sat round Him listening, whose clothes still held the fragrance of the sea or the soil, whose eyes burned with the fanaticism of the zealot, or whose faces were seamed with lines of greed and fear written by the weary years of keeping ravening hunger from the door — heard, perhaps without fully comprehending that what they heard were the first principles of a new

religion. The scene could hardly have been lowlier; though there were men who may have had the vision of a vaster mountain rising out of a sultry desert, whose peaks the thunders had smitten and the lightnings had touched as with smoke of fire. But the inner must have impressed them even more than the outer differences. Here there was neither earthquake nor tempest, but in the beautiful springtime, amid the bursting flowers, with the radiant heaven above and the smiling lake below, the gracious lips of the Master dropped a wisdom which, as both pure and peaceable, was destined to become the law-book of a higher, a wider, and a more universal religion.

3. There is another point that we must note: the arena He chose as His schoolhouse; it was the busy and populous, though rustic and backward, province of Galilee. He avoided the capital, which a self-conscious teacher who wanted to build a new religion on the ancient substructures of Judaism would have instinctively selected. It was, though not the cradle, yet the seat and centre of His race and its worship. There was the temple with its priesthood, its ornate and venerated ritual, adorned and endeared by the traditions which for centuries had clustered round it. Jerusalem was even then a city loved by the pilgrim. Poets had praised it as beautiful for situation and the joy of the whole earth; Mount Zion was the city of the great King, a city whose wealth and wisdom, whose glory and majesty, seemed to the imagination of her sons to realize the dreams of the golden age. There the people of God had been besieged by the heathen, and had been delivered by the outstretched hand of the Most High. The sublime prophet of the exile had broken into immortal poetry in praise of the city where God dwelt, towards which all nations were to look and within which they were to gather. Athens,

illustrious in wisdom, might be named the eye of Greece; Rome might be then the synonym of imperial, political, and secular power, as it was to be to later men the seat of ecclesiastical authority; Mecca may speak to us of a prophet that conquered by the sword, though he reigns by the might of the word he uttered; while Benares is eloquent of a religion of caste which rules as with a rod of iron the millions of a race we think we govern. But Jerusalem, as the creation and home of the religion of the one God, is a city dear to all who love Him. What place, then, so fit for the ministry which Jesus contemplated? There He would have found the fit soil for His seed, rabbis to listen to Him, scribes to report Him, priests to hold Him up.

But though Jesus had the Jews' love for the city and knew that a prophet could not perish out of Jerusalem; yet He also saw how impossible it would be to educate His disciples there. The strife of sects would have marred the serenity of His own soul, and have proved still more fatal to the tractability of the men He wanted to teach. Nature is easily made abortive; man thrives best in silence. Where controversy rages, discipline may fail to subdue; curiosity may be fed, but reason is starved. What distracts the mind will prevent its culture. And so Jesus wished that the simple men He had called should not, in the process and period of pupilage, be perplexed by the confusion or maddened by the diversity of the tongues spoken by a multitude of minds. Hence He chose for His schoolroom a seclusion where meditation and growth were possible, where He and His disciples could stand face to face, look with untroubled eyes upon the truth, and feel God to be both near and real. He was soon, indeed, to discover that even where the

lean streets and grimy walls of a city did not shut Him in, the dissonant voices of men could make themselves heard. But in Galilee the towns were villages, the fields were broad, the lake was open and free. Here He could stand between His disciples and the men who would have troubled them, keeping their souls open to God and speaking to them concerning "the kingdom."

III

But, now, let us see whether we can find in the Men Jesus educated and in His discourses any trace of His own prior history and personal experiences which had been their occasion.

1. In the first part of the Gospels we learn that Jesus had been allowed, in accordance with the common practice,* to use the synagogues. Mark † is on this point as emphatic as Matthew. ‡ They agree that His ministry began in the synagogue, and both specify individual instances, as at Capernaum,§ and in His own country,|| where the people ask, Since He is but a carpenter and a carpenter's son, whence His wisdom? Luke, who agrees here with the other Synoptics, represents Jesus as teaching in the synagogues of Galilee; but he adds a new element which throws light upon His upbringing and the habits in which he was trained at Nazareth, when he says that He entered, "as His custom was," into the

* Cf. John xviii. 20; Acts ix. 20; xiii. 5, 14–16; xiv. 1; xvii. 1, 2, 17, xviii. 4, 26; xix. 8.

† Mark i. 21, 29, 39.

‡ Matt. iv. 23; cf. ix. 35, where the statement is repeated. What we seek is what shall explain both the form and the matter of the earlier teaching.

§ Mark ii. 1; cf. Matt. viii. 5–6; xii. 9.

|| Mark vi. 2; cf. Matt. xiii. 54.

synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up to read.* But His free and unconventional speech soon brought trouble. At Nazareth the people in the synagogue, when they heard, "were all filled with wrath."† "They were astonished at His teaching; for He taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes."‡ This comparison was not felt to be quite pleasant; the people asked, "What is this new teaching?"§ and the scribes watched how they might entangle Him in His talk.‖ They further plotted how they might destroy Him, for, as Luke says, "they were filled with madness, and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus."¶ (*a*) Now criticism easily becomes judgment, and we know that the synagogues could both judge and punish a man,** their right to do so, especially in religious matters, being expressly recognized by the imperial law.†† Exclusion from the synagogue was therefore equal to excommunication; and Jesus, shut out from the places where He had been wont to teach, learned to regard them as seats of suffering and symbols of injustice. (*β*) John tells us that fear of the Pharisees kept many of the rulers from confessing their faith, "lest they should be put out of the synagogue,"‡‡ and Jesus warns His disciples that they will be "scourged in the synagogues,"§§

* Luke iv. 15–16, 44; vi. 6. † Luke iv. 28.

‡ Mark i. 22. Matthew places almost identical words in the mouth of the multitudes who had listened to the "sermon on the mount," vii. 2.

§ Mark i. 27; xi. 18; Luke xix. 47. ‖ Matt. xxii. 15.

¶ vi. 11. cf. Matt. xii. 9; Mark iii. 1–6.

** Acts ix. 2; xxii. 19; xxvi. 11.

†† Hence the attitude of Gallio (Acts xviii. 12–17), and the scourging of Paul, though a Roman citizen (2 Cor. xi. 24). The distinction familiar and frequent in Roman law between a legal and illegal religion and its bearing upon persecution is well stated and illustrated by Neander, *Church History*, i. 19–128 (Bohn's ed.).

‡‡ John xii. 42; cf. ix. 22, xvi. 2.

§§ Matt. x. 17; xxiii. 34; Mark xiii. 9; Luke xxi. 12.

and bids them beware of the men who love there to occupy "the chief seats,"* and not to be anxious as to how or what they shall answer the authorities that have rule there.† (γ) It is a fair inference that Jesus when He addressed the men on the hill, in the Sermon on the Mount, had already suffered at the hands of those who ruled in the synagogues; and the traces of this suffering may be seen in what He says as to "the hypocrites" who do their alms "in the synagogues and in the streets to the sound of a trumpet," and there "love to stand and pray."‡

2. But this exclusion involved a gain which was greater than the loss; to be excommunicated by the rulers of the synagogues was to be forced to appeal to the people; and to reach them He had, because silenced within, to teach and preach without, where the objects seen in the open air, amid the scenes of nature — the expanse of heaven, the breadth and the brightness of the earth, the movement of the sea and the sound of the waters — wove themselves into the texture of His speech and the substance of His thought. He saw the cities where men toiled, the fields which their industry cultivated, where they sowed the grain which the soil fed and the dew watered and the sun ripened, where they planted the olive, tended the vine, trained the fig, watched the growth of the mustard tree and the sycamores which stood by the wayside. And he knew by experience the desert places where men by day watched the resplendent sun setting in the heavens, and by night could see the starry heavens. The ancient and historic cities like Tyre and Sidon, the well-watered land on which had been built cities whose modern names suggested equally the imperial Cæsar and the Herodian Philip; or, like Caper-

* Mark xii. 39; Matt. xxiii. 6; Luke xi. 43; xx. 46.
† Luke xii. 11. ‡ Matt. vi. 2, 5.

naum — where soldiers, centurions, noble men dwelt, and tax-gatherers who "sat at the receipt of custom," and claimed "tribute" even from those who could not pay it — spoke of an historical past and of a large present, as well as an empire which could not live without its legions and the money which paid their "wages." The hills to the sides of which cities like His own Nazareth clung, and up which they climbed; the lake with its fish, the boat with its fishermen and their nets, whence He could speak, as it floated upon the water, to the people who sat ranged along the shore; the mountains whose tops seemed to reach heaven, the trees which fringed the cup-like valleys formed by craters of extinct volcanos — were all fitter places for free teaching and spontaneous speech than a synagogue, where tradition governed and the ruler reigned by virtue of the very law he had to administer. And so the change of place affected the destination as well as the matter and the form of the teaching; it was addressed to the people and freshened by the breath of nature. The school is a subtle maker of scholasticism; and if Jesus had been simply a teacher bound in the traditions of the synagogue, we should never have had the common human interest He showed or the vivid and natural speech He used as He taught on the hill.

IV

1. The principle thus illustrated by reference to the synagogue, receives even fuller expression in a defence of His disciples. (i) The Galilean Pharisees had invoked the help of the Rabbinical School at Jerusalem, and certain of its scribes had come to watch the new Teacher and to criticize Him.* The point they seized on was characteristic.

* Mark vii. 1, 2.

Your "disciples eat their bread with defiled hands." Why do they thus break "the tradition of the elders"? The reply of Jesus must have shocked and startled the good men. "What is the warrant of your tradition? To keep it you break the commandment of God. Thus Moses said, 'Honour thy father and thy mother,' but ye say, 'Our wealth is Corban,'* given to God, and so it cannot be used, since it is God's, for the benefit of any earthly parent." So He says "the Word of God is made void by your tradition." (ii) He then turns to the multitude and bids them hear and understand. Defilement comes not from without, but from within. "All meats are clean, but out of the heart of man there proceed evil thoughts, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness." † What could more illuminate His argument as to the impotence of the law? It is not enough to cleanse the body; the soul must be cleansed before the man can be clean. But this precisely is what the law cannot do. Men who turn trifles into divine commands degrade God without magnifying the trifles; and without either purifying or uplifting the men they have compelled to obedience.

(iii) He did not fast like the Pharisees. The Baptist had "come eating no bread, nor drinking wine"; but since his piety was unlike theirs they disliked and condemned it as a special form of asceticism and said, "He hath a devil." Jesus "sat at meat" in the houses of Pharisees like Simon, or of publicans like Levi, and they said, "Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber." ‡ In characteristic fashion He made these opposite judgments answer each other, and with delicate yet humorous irony He

* Mark vii. 6–11. † Mark vii. 14–23.
‡ Matt. xi. 15–19; Luke vii. 30–5.

likened the men of His generation to children sitting in the market-place and calling one to another: "We piped unto you, and ye did not dance; we mourned, and ye did not weep."* That was enough; the men acted like children and played at religion. "Wisdom was justified of her works."†

2. Another point as important concerned the keeping of the Sabbath. (iv) The Mosaic law held it to be so sacred that death was decreed to the man who should defile the day.‡ The man who gathered sticks upon the Sabbath was stoned till "he died."§ Precept and sanction were exactly to the Pharisaic mind; both were elaborated till the Sabbath became a burden, and the penalty for violation a tyranny of body over spirit. Hence there was no point where the action of Jesus could have been more certainly foretold; and here He came into early and vehement collision with the scribes. They watched how He would behave on the Sabbath in the synagogue, and even in the house of a "ruler of the Pharisees";|| for they did not think watching a labour, however irksome it might be and impossible to a generous soul. He inquired, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath, to save or to destroy life?" "They held their peace";¶ and they could do no other, for had they spoken they must have condemned either themselves or their theory of the day. But they had the faculty which loved to judge without giving reasons for the judgment; and so the moment He had acted they went out and took counsel with the Herodians how they might destroy Him. But quite as significant was His apology for His disciples.** One Sabbath He and they had walked through the

* Matt. xi. 17; Luke vii. 32.
† Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 35.
‡ Exod. xxxi. 14, 15; xxxv. 2.
§ Num. xv. 32–6.
|| Mark iii. 2; Luke xiv. 1.
¶ Mark iii. 4; ix. 34.
** Mark ii. 23–8; Matt. xii. 1–8; Luke vi. 1–5.

cornfields, and they had plucked and rubbed in their hands some of the ears, and eaten the corn. That was not lawful; why did He allow it? He replied, "David, when hungry, entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread," and every week the priests who minister at the altar fruitlessly break the Sabbath. Your law, therefore, is not absolute; the service of man where work is mercy, or the service of God where worship is work, may supersede it. Understand, then, what God meaneth when He saith, "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice,"* and you will not judge as you do. "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." All positive laws are provisional, and are designed to promote human weal. The means must subserve the end; the end can never become subservient to the means. The special case contains a universal principle. We may say of the whole Mosaic legislation what is true of this special article: Man is lord of the Sabbath; the Sabbath was never intended to be the lord of man. In all similar points the early teaching of Jesus showed an independent attitude to tradition and the law.

V

1. We have next to note how the conduct and character of Jesus defined and interpreted His words. To the conventional Jew, especially to the Pharisee and scribe, He was an enigma and anomalous, a reverent man, zealous in good works, loving the Scriptures which God had given, yet standing aloof from the usages which the religious men in Israel observed and honoured. He did not give alms, or fast, or pray in public, or keep the Sabbath, or wash His hands before eating. What, then, was He?

* Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7.

They could not call Him a Gentile, for He was by birth and breeding, by belief and custom, a Jew; nor could they say He was an atheist, though He lived like one; the most they could do was to charge Him with being inspired of the devil, though the charge died under His analysis.* But the conduct which made Him an enigma to the scribe made His words luminous to the apostles. His neglect of the things the Pharisees held to be vital to godliness became their severest condemnation; for what His piety found superfluous could not be essential to religion. Thus a Pharisee asks Jesus to dinner, and marvels that He does not wash before He eats. His only reply is to reproach the sect to which His host belongs with cleansing "the outside of the cup and the platter," while their inward part was "full of extortion and wickedness."† He does not mean to praise dirt, but to affirm that as "a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," and that religion ought to think more of the heart than of the hands. Cleanliness may be next to godliness, but can never be a substitute for it, any more than water can take the place of God. This teaching would have been meaningless and impotent without the witness and comment of His conduct and character.

2. The higher law, then, which Jesus embodied superseded the lower laws of Judaism. The ideal of the Pharisee was separation; it was produced by his love of holiness, and produced the holiness he loved. To realize it his laws were designed; they made him a separated person living amid a separated people. He built a hedge round the law that the law might stand as a hedge round him. But the ideal of Jesus was love of man, the fellow-feeling that begot fellowship. He did not so fear infection as to hate and shun the sick; He so loved the sick that He did not

* Luke xi. 15–20. † Mark vii. 1–23; Luke xi. 3–41.

fear infection. He did not preach repentance to the sinful from the lofty platform of His own sinlessness, reproaching them, as it were, with His own irreproachableness; but He spoke from the common plain of His own manhood, as a man who knew Himself to be full of God to men who knew themselves to be vacant of Him. Hence He was not contented to speak from the pulpit of the synagogue; He must meet men who were His brothers; He must love them, for they are His neighbours. Hence He dines with both Pharisee and publican; He is the friend of scribe and sinner alike, though, true to their respective characters, the scribes reproach Him with His friendship for the sinners; but the sinners never dream of reproaching Him with His friendship for the scribes. The touch of nature made Him intelligible to those who were in character most remote from Him; but the art and quality of character held apart from Him those who were in nature more akin. Hence all His acts were natural, and expressed the grace that dwelt within. He worked no miracle to convert or astonish the Pharisee; but He cured the sick, gave sight to the blind, unstopped the ears of the deaf, healed the broken-hearted, preached the Gospel to the poor, and set at liberty those that were bound. Hence He could not allow His neighbourliness to be fettered by ritual, nor His humanity to be narrowed by the law which not only separated man from man, but fabricated by human art distinctions which were turned into religion by the invoked sanction of God. And the faith that was in Him did not simply terminate on man; it formed a disposition that want could not embitter or poverty undignify. He had no place to lay His head; yet no head that ever wore a crown had a majesty equal to His. The birds of the air had their nests; but He had His Father in heaven, who had numbered the very hairs

of the head, and knew He was of infinitely more worth than all the birds that ever sang in time.

3. Jesus, then, began His career as a Redeemer by being a Teacher, and the implied functions in His case were coincident rather than opposed. New thought makes a new man, and He acted as one who so believed. While the forces opposed to Him determined the form of His thought, they did not contribute anything to its substance; that was made by the consciousness of what He was and what He had come to do. Our effort at the analysis of His teaching may have thrown a too exclusive emphasis on the opposition He encountered, and hidden the fact that its occasion was His success. Had His words been without authority, and awakened no response, His enemies would have been few and silent. They were angry, for they feared Him; and He was angry with them, for He knew that their antagonism came from fear of Him and not from love of the truth. But the movement caused by His early preaching was extensive and intense. "His fame went throughout all Syria."* Matthew says He was followed by "great multitudes from Galilee and Decapolis, and Jerusalem and Judæa, and from beyond Jordan."† Mark adds to the list of places whence the multitudes came, "Idumæa" and "about Tyre and Sidon."‡ Luke seems to distinguish among those "which came to hear Him," "a great multitude of His disciples" from "a great number of the people from all Judæa and Jerusalem, and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon."§ And these mixed multitudes supplied the disciples who gathered on the mount to listen to Jesus.

* Matt. iv. 24. † iv. 25.
‡ Mark iii. 8. § Luke vi. 17.

IV

THE TEACHING OF JESUS IN ITS FIRST PERIOD

I

1. OUR oldest and best epitome of the early teaching of Jesus stands expressed in what we are accustomed to name, from the form it receives in Matthew, "the Sermon on the Mount." It is, indeed, incorrectly so named, if by "sermon" we mean a premeditated, reasoned, and consecutive discourse spoken on a single occasion. But just as little can we describe this epitome as a collection of independent sayings, massed together without regard to time and place. We have, happily, two versions of what seems the same sermon, Matthew's and Luke's; the one represents it as spoken upon "the mountain" and to "His disciples";* but the other as preached after He had come down from "the mountain" and "stood on a level place" with "the twelve, whom also He named apostles."† Luke's version is the shorter, and to many of the sayings which Matthew incorporates in the sermon he gives a different historical and biographical setting.‡ But it is easier to explain the abbreviations and displace-

* Matt. v. 1.

† Luke vi. 12–17.

‡ Cf. Matt. v. 3; vii. 27; Luke vi. 20–49; xi. 1–4, 9–13; xii. 22–31; xvi. 13; xvii. 24.

ments in Luke than the enlargements and misplacings in Matthew. In Matthew the sermon is distinguished by the vividness and the reality of the local colouring; in Luke it is comparatively colourless. In Matthew its background, which throws all its propositions, both negative and positive, into the most impressive relief, is constituted by Pharisaic teaching and the religion of the synagogue; but in Luke it may be said to be without background or any feeling for the contrast which heightens effects and justifies conclusions. Matthew's, too, is more of a unity and, in spite of its greater length, less mixed than Luke's version, which has sayings uttered in connections where they can be better understood and explained than when placed as here. In Matthew's sermon there is a continuity and a completeness which speaks of nearness to the author's mind, producing a more accurate report; while Luke's* may be described as broken and fragmentary, like a series of notes shortened from having been long kept in memory before being written down. But there are too many gaps in Matthew's argument to allow us to describe the document as a "sermon"; yet it is too much distinguished by coherence of thought and unity of purpose to be named a mere collection of isolated sayings. Its continuity is, indeed, subjective rather than objective; its thought is vagrant, but not discontinuous or broken. It may not have the order we expect in a carefully knit argument, where each proposition rises logically out of its predecessor; but it has the order spontaneously begotten by similar questions in minds that must think together if they think at all. Hence the "sermon" seems to have the characteristics of a series of notes or memoranda of conversations on the

*Cf. Luke vi. 39 with Matt. xv. 14; Luke vi. 40 with Matt. x. 24, 25; Luke vi. 45 with Matt. xii. 34, 35.

mount, embodying what we may describe as answers to the inarticulate questions of men who were disciples in attitude rather than in mind.

2. We do not conceive this so-called Sermon on the Mount, which is thoroughly in harmony with Jesus' character and history, as a sudden outbreak of words addressed to a mere promiscuous crowd; but as having risen out of His past speech and action. Its immediate antecedent was His going about in Galilee, "teaching in the synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom."* That preaching had suggested many questions, which may be phrased and divided thus: (i) "What is the kingdom you preach about? Who are its citizens? What are their characters and their duties? (ii) Who are you yourself? Are you greater than Abraham or Moses or the prophets? By what authority do you contradict the scribes, who read and explain to us the law? (iii) What do you mean when you speak of making men the children of the Father? Do you mean to change the religion we have received by tradition? (iv) What would you substitute for this religion, for the almsgiving, the prayer, and the fasting we hear of in the synagogue? (v) We believe in one God; whom do you believe in? What does God signify to you, and what does He do for men filled with faith in Him? (vi) Have you a new law in your new religion? If so, what is it? Is it based on faith in the God you speak of?" These, or something like these, were the questions which the disciples could not but regard as legitimate, and which Jesus took as meaning a desire to learn. Every such desire He felt it dutiful to gratify, especially as they involved difficulties which He, as a Master and Teacher, was bound to set Himself to remove. And this was the endeavour of Jesus.

* Matt. iv. 23; cf. Mark i. 14, 39; Luke iv. 43–44.

What His hearers, who were disciples though not apostles, wanted, were the signs of knowledge which all could recognize.

3. The discussions which ensued in consequence of these difficulties constitute less a sermon than what we may term "sessions," such sessions being so coördinated and combined in Matthew as to appear a single connected and coherent discourse. Their general theme may be said to be the new religion in antithesis to the old, i.e. the kingdom of heaven in preference to any kingdom of earth man can either found or establish. This kingdom is here presented as founded by the coming of its King. He came, indeed, as the Creator of "righteousness," a term almost as characteristic of Matthew as of Paul, though it summed up to Matthew the purpose of the Law, and to Paul the truth of the Gospel. Law and Gospel only expressed to the men identical ideas.

The term sermon so interpreted may be said to be distinguished by the several sessions into which the discussions fall: the kingdom is conceived first through its citizens, whose final beatitude is persecution for righteousness' sake;* secondly through the laws that regulate man's conduct towards men, where the motto is the need of a righteousness which exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees;† thirdly through the laws which determined the worship or service of God;‡ fourthly a discussion of the question, what is religion, introduced by a warning against outward or ceremonial "righteousness" § done "to be seen of men"; fifthly a searching inquiry into what is the fundamental idea and ultimate purpose of religion, or the knowledge of God and the attainment of His righteousness;|| and

* v. 3–10. † v. 11–20. ‡ v. 21–48.
§ vi. 1–18. || vi. 19–34.

sixthly through the new duties to man, to God, and to self* which spring from the new manhood created of God.

II

The theme of the first session may be said to be "the kingdom" as conceived through its citizens. This chapter, indeed, which is the fifth of the gospel as a whole, partakes more of the character of a sermon than any subsequent section.

1. The Beatitudes which constitute the opening sentences are best conceived as a series of maxims which express the ideal of the perfect man as a man who contributes to the common good; because he is happy in himself and possesses the qualities that make for happiness. Each beatitude has an ethical basis, and denotes a quality at once moral and religious; the whole may be said to represent religion as realized in character, and character as realized religion applied to the order of society which is here conceived as the kingdom of heaven. To conceive the miserable man as a source and factor of misery is to recognize not so much a principle of philosophy as a fact of experience; but to state the nature, the causes, and the constituents of happiness is to enunciate not so much a fact of experience as a principle of religion. Jesus does not here discuss the relation of holiness to happiness, or happiness to well-being; He simply pronounces the man who realizes a given character as blessed. But in defining the State through the citizen, in assuming the identity of the perfect man with the ideal State, and in declaring the

* vii. 1–27.

perfect to be the only happy man, He turns philosophy into religion.

2. Plato tells us that "the best and justest is also the happiest man, whether seen or unseen by God and man"; and he adds that "the most unjust is also the most miserable," even though he be the most powerful person in the State. He says also that "the true legislator desires to have the city the best and happiest possible"; not the richest, for the rich man may be a rogue, but the most virtuous, for where virtue is happiness must be. Aristotle distinguishes between prosperity and pleasure, and says that while the vulgar may think the tyrant who can bathe to the full in bodily enjoyments both happy and blessed, yet the philosopher knows that only the man who lives well and acts well is happy, since happiness is a state which only the best and most honourable men realize. And this state must be an energy, i.e. an exercise of the highest or contemplative nature; in a word, happiness consists in the cultivation of philosophy in the temper and method of a philosopher. Boethius, repeating the old yet anticipating the new, tells us that beatitude is a state which is perfected by the aggregation of all good things, and he describes the varied paths by which men have laboured to attain to it. The greatest of the schoolmen defined felicity as the ultimate end of all action; while a modern like Spinoza more truly conceived beatitude as peace of mind begotten by the immediate intuition of God. But the idea of Jesus is at once too rich to be defined and too simple to be analyzed. He does not tell us what happiness is; He simply specifies the qualities in respect of which He pronounces men to be happy. They are "the poor in spirit"; "they that mourn"; "the meek"; "they that hunger and thirst after righteous-

ness"; "the merciful"; "the pure in heart"; "the peacemakers"; "the persecuted for righteousness' sake." He uses no abstract and no philosophical terms, but all His qualities are virtues, all His virtues are rooted in religion, and all are altruistic. Beatitude He conceives to be not a passive, but an active state. God is no idle deity. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,"* said Jesus; and Paul speaks of Him as "the ever happy God."†

3. Happiness is thus not accidental or circumstantial, but essential; it is not put upon a man from without, but grows up from within, just as a good will expresses the goodness of a nature. The good act does not make the nature good, but the good nature does spontaneously the good deed. And as the citizens are so must the city be; each is conceived as the duplicate of the other; for what is society but a colossal man created by the corporate union of all its atoms, or constituent persons? Jesus sees that the material of which a State is built must exist before the State; and so He does not seek to make good men by means of good States, but good States by means of good men. Bad men will make good laws bad; good men will make bad laws lose their power to do evil. And so the Beatitudes show the means by which Jesus expresses His ideal and which realize it as regards what we call "the city," or society, but what He called "the kingdom of God."

i. "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."‡ There are those who think that Luke's form,§ "Blessed are ye poor," is simpler and more Christlike than Matthew's. But Jesus did not imagine that poverty was a virtue any more than He fancied wealth

* John v. 17. † 1 Tim. i. 11. ‡ iv. 3. § vi. 20.

to be a crime. What He feared was the "trust in riches,"* the pride of purse, the faith in "the almighty dollar," the idea, common then as now, that God would think twice before He damned a man of a given rank or status. Jesus put His social gospel in the first place; He warns the poor against the sordid love of gold, as later He warned the rich against their ostentatious love of purple and fine linen. Hence the phrase "in spirit" qualifies "the poor," as later "in heart" qualifies "the pure." It denotes the region where the poverty is to be realized; and means the renunciation and detachment of self from all earthly goods, which not only minister to vanity, but in which pride or egotism find only occasions for gratulation and self-enlargement. Jesus teaches man to respect himself and not to glory in untoward conditions; for by the "in spirit" He bids him avoid the mistake of identifying poverty with destitution, which is as terrible in its own order as the correlative mistake of identifying well-being with abundance. The poor are to lift up their heads, and respect themselves; but neither envy nor hate the rich because of their riches. The noble man will not demean himself by thinking ignobly of either God or man; the mean man will never by vanity puff himself into greatness. "The poor in spirit" are therefore in the most positive of all states, where the capacity for the highest good is proved by the intensity and the reality of the desire to attain it. Hence this poverty is not incompatible with wealth, but with trust in it; nor with want, but with the pride that is as vain of want as the fool whose barns were stored to bursting was vain of his abundance.† Hence Jesus says: "Theirs is the kingdom of heaven." In that kingdom there are no rich and no poor, but only men. There is room there for

* Mark x. 23–24; cf. Psalm lii. 7; xlix. 6. † Luke xii. 16–21.

the righteous, but no room for any one who seeks satisfaction in anything less than God.

ii. The second beatitude runs: "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted."* This postulates the evil and the sorrow of the world, as the first assumed its poverty and addressed the poor. Both beatitudes are significant of the social state of the followers of Christ, but the attitude commended is in each case very different: men are to overcome poverty of fact by cultivating poverty of spirit; they will respect themselves the more that they pay but small respect to the things that perish with the using. Evil indeed cannot be resisted by evil, the wicked will never vanquish wickedness; only the man who faces sin as a penitent has any chance against the sin he confesses. He prevails by his sorrow and conquers in the strength of his mourning. Thought has perplexed itself over the function of sorrow in this scheme of things. Man, it has been said, was made to mourn; but Jesus says that the only fruitful and blessed mourning is that which as comforted of God becomes the condition and symbol of the rarest joy. The comfort of God qualifies the mourning; to be a mourning which He can comfort it must be a renunciation of the evil He has condemned. Pessimism enfeebles because it degrades a man; the happiness which comes forth from the grief which evil has caused, strengthens while it purifies. Schopenhauer declared "a perfect saint and a perfect sinner to be alike impossible"; for man is born to fight a battle which cannot end without bloodshed, in which the victor must also be the vanquished. But the man who so thought never knew how suffering purified, how sorrow ennobled, how consolation could arm with the grace of God.

* v. 4.

Irritability is weakness; where happiness is an illusion and life a passion which can never be cheered by the presence of God, the very capability of comfort will perish; and with it the desire for personal existence and the hope of a larger to-morrow.

iii. "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth."* The heir and the inheritance seem here strangely incompatible. But Jesus does not say, "blessed are the weak," or "those held under and despised"; but "the meek." This is the term He uses to qualify Himself: "I am meek."† And later Zechariah is quoted as bidding "the daughter of Zion" behold "the King who cometh to her, meek, riding upon an ass."‡ The term stands opposed to "pride" or "vain-glory," not to majesty or strength. Indeed, no moral quality so taxes our courage or implies a more utter conquest of weakness by will. We may think of Jesus as "meek," but not as feeble; in His lowliness He is so potent that all the adverse forces of the world fail to bend Him. The "meek" are men who do not seek or desire revenge, who bear no malice, who do not find their pleasure in causing pain, who are able to esteem good fortune as fortune and not as reward they have earned by their own merits.

"They also Serve who only Stand and Wait."

"Meek" thus expresses the same attitude towards men that "poor in spirit" expresses towards God. It denotes a man not swollen with pride or boastful of the full barn, who receives as from himself the beatitude and the grace which God's hands alone can give; but they who are so empty of good that they can hope to possess it only through

* v. 5. † Matt. xi. 29. ‡ xxi. 5.

possession of God. And must not the man who can say "God is mine" "inherit the earth" in an infinite degree? He who feels that he must serve in order to live, that other men are more necessary to him than he is to them, knows that he cannot give unless they are there to receive. And "the earth" the "meek" are to inherit is not material, but spiritual; it is the Holy Land which is the symbol of "the kingdom of heaven." That is the only and the sufficient reward for all who love God; and such are "the meek" of the earth.

iv. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled."* This amplifies and fills out the three ideas which had preceded. For the first beatitude expresses the attitude of the good man to God, the second his attitude to evil; the third, his attitude to man; and the fourth, his attitude to righteousness. After this he "hungers and thirsts"; without it he cannot live, and his happiness is to consist in being satisfied without ever suffering from satiety. It stands, therefore, in a succession which it fitly rounds off and completes. No good man feels the preëminence of his own goodness, for he knows he ought to be better than he is; and the hunger and thirst after righteousness are natural to him. A Persian mystic used to say that to find God we must lose ourselves; but it is no less true that to find ourselves we must lose self, i.e. we must die to live, cease to think parsimoniously of the little, shut-in, railed-off self in order that we may merge our individuated being in the universe. Life is made by its ends, not by its means, which are depraved the moment they are turned into laws man is bound to obey. And so the quest after righteousness, which is an end, is infinitely nobler than the pursuit of pleasure, which is but

* v. 6.

a means to enjoyment. And they are distinguished thus: the one does, the other does not, satisfy; the love of righteousness grows with exercise, but the very capacity for pleasure dies with indulgence. An old English scholar once described another in these terms: "He appeared to be reasonable and just, as though Justice herself had been in him looking out at his eyes and speaking at his mouth," which was but to describe him as a man whose thirst after righteousness had been slaked.

v. "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy."* This beatitude seems to breathe the very spirit of Christ. He taught us to pray daily to be "forgiven, as we forgive." As Jesus conceived matters there could be no righteousness without mercy, or mercy without righteousness. The very conjunction of the terms must have come as a shock to His hearers. The Pharisaic righteousness was not kind, but narrow, exclusive, forbidding; the very almsgiving for which it was a generic term was too ostentatious to be generous. There is nothing so difficult as to prevent alms degrading both giver and receiver; and the sequence of the Beatitudes proves that Jesus regarded "mercy" as at once the corrective and the correlative of righteousness. To think of suffering and want as God's mode of chastising personal sin may not tend to pity; but to think of the person with the pity of God is to see in his offence only an occasion for forgiveness. Like alone can mingle with like. The eye that lives can alone see the light; the music within must go forth from the soul in order that the music without may not be mute; and the reward of the merciful is more mercy. Simon Patrick says of his friend John Smith, the Cambridge Platonist: "Those who knew him well saw love bubbling and springing up in his soul,

* v. 7.

and flowing out to all; and that love unfeigned, without guile, hypocrisy, or dissimulation. I cannot tell you how his soul was universalized, how tenderly he embraced all God's creatures in his arms, more especially men, and principally those in whom he beheld the image of his heavenly Father." He had the godliness which was god-likeness; the mercifulness that had obtained mercy.

vi. "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God."* This seems to me the sublimest of all the Beatitudes, whether regarded as principle or as promise. For purity of heart is higher even than mercy; to see God is the greatest thing possible to man. The craving of the saintly in all ages has been for the vision which comes only where the soul is pure. The saint is the real seer, and his vision is eternal. "Without virtue and real goodness God is but a name, a dry and empty notion." These words are true; and so are these, though they speak in the quaint tongue of the seventeenth century: "When Zoroaster's scholars asked him what they should do to get winged souls, such as might soar aloft in the bright beams of Divine Truth, he bade them bathe themselves in the waters of life: they then asked him what these waters were; and he replied, the four cardinal virtues, which are the four rivers of Paradise." The disciple is not above his Master, and none can know the truth as it is in Jesus save the Christ-like in nature; "the pure in heart shall see God."

vii. "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God."† To see God with the eyes of Jesus is to love Him as Jesus loved; and therefore to be a son as He was; and the Son of God can only act as a peacemaker among men. The peaceful alone can create peace; the warrior carries war within him; the spirit that loves the

* v. 8. † v. 9.

fray will make the feud. As God maketh wars to cease,* so the god-like have no pleasure in the shedding of blood. The life which came from God His sons will not extinguish. He who delights in God carries within the eternal peace. From it war can never issue.

viii. "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."† This is the last of the Beatitudes; in what follows the person is changed, the direct supersedes the indirect address; the universalized idea is particularized, application being made. As the Beatitudes began they end, with the promise of the kingdom. The kingdom whose home is heaven may stand in contrast to the experiences of its citizens upon earth. Men are not righteous without suffering; they who cross the conventions of society must expect "persecution." We punish crime; but crime causes the innocent to suffer. While persecution is of man, all righteousness is of God.

4. Then the Beatitudes are rounded off with three reasons for consolation, which are specially addressed to the disciples as a persecuted remnant.‡ (i) They are to be esteemed as peculiarly and preëminently happy when evil is spoken against them "falsely"; for their innocence will double the guilt of the persecutor, who thus does a wrong not only without cause, but against the light of reason or the weight of evidence. (ii) Their reward is in heaven. In this case alone, which stands outside the Beatitudes and, as it were, stoops to the level of men nursed in Judaism, is there any mention of a future reward. Jesus does not say with Helvetius "that public utility is the principle of all human virtue." Nor does He think with Paley that to do good is to act for the sake of "reward,"

* Psalm xlvi. 9. † v. 10. ‡ v. 11–12.

for His morality is not one of self-interest, but of self-denial. While He does not think of a universe which God governs as the home of brutish evil or of forsaken truth, He as little conceives good to consist in seeking our own advantage. It has been said that in this the doctrine of Jesus is not so much religious as moral; but we say, on the contrary, He can conceive no religion that is not moral, and no morality that is not religious. His morals are all of God, and His religion is realized in the service of man. Yet (iii), He would not have His disciples imagine that in the persecutions they were to suffer they stood alone; they belonged to the goodly fellowship of the prophets. Evil hates the good it sees; good feels that in evil lies the tragedy of life. Where the Master had been hated the disciples could not be loved; yet when most hated He knew that He was not alone, for the Father was with Him. Nor did they suffer in solitude; they lived in an invisible yet real society made up of the saints of God, who had been evil entreated because they had daily to rebuke the sins which men loved. "So persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

III

The theme of the second session, where the change from the indirect to the direct address is significant and continuous, is less easy to describe than the first was to state, yet this theme may be said to be made up of two parts, respectively, concerned with His disciples* and with Himself. †

1. The Beatitudes define the city through the citizens: the disciples are citizens and the question is, What manner

* v. 13–16. † v. 17–23.

of men ought they, whether disciples or citizens, to be?* The transition to function and duty is logical and therefore natural. Where character and conduct correspond, an ideal relation is realized; and the men who realize it affect society in a twofold way. They are (i) preservative, (ii) illuminative. As preservative the disciples are to be "the salt of the earth," as illuminative "the light of the world."† As the "salt" they save humanity from corruption; as the "light" they flood the earth with glory.

(i) There was no idea more characteristic of Hebrew thought than the value of a good man to the State. For the sake of the righteous man God spared and protected the city; and Jesus only extended to mankind the principle Abraham had enunciated in his prayer to God for Sodom.‡ The righteous man saved men, which function, Jesus says, His disciples are to fulfil by the same necessity as salt does its work. This idea of preservation not of set or conscious purpose, but by natural properties naturally acting, is certainly contained in the figure. The man who thinks himself so good as to be necessary for the preservation of humanity is not good enough for the purpose; indeed, his good is no better than that which is done to obtain a mere material reward. Jesus tells us not that the tree is good by virtue of its fruit, but that the fruit is good by virtue of the tree.§ The salt by its very nature or inherent quality as salt gives savour to what is eaten and preserves what is without life in itself. The last calamity that can happen to a State is

* Matt. v. 13–16, cf. Mark ix. 50; iv. 21; Luke xiv. 34–35; viii. 16; xi. 33.

† The phrases may be described as condensed or undeveloped parables, which Jesus may have in speech expanded in the method of what we may term His middle period. In this, His earliest mature utterance, His distinctive love of nature and feeling for its significance at once appears.

‡ Genesis xviii. 23–32.

§ Matt. vii. 17–11; xii. 33; Luke vi. 43.

that goodness should cease to dwell within it. And all goodness is real. What has only the name of good is fit for nothing but "to be cast out and trodden under feet of men."

(ii) Jesus then changes the figure in order that He may impress the idea the more upon the imagination of the disciples: "Ye are the light of the world." They sat in the light; it made their world beautiful, for without radiance where would colour be? What the sun and its light are to the earth, that were the disciples to be to man. It might be that they were but luminaries whose light was all borrowed or derivative, stars which do not dispel the darkness, but simply make it visible; still, they were to follow nature and to shine. For without them there would be nothing to illuminate the night or show the vastness of the heavens; things become colourless and indistinguishable, and glory fades from earth and sea and sky. When night falls darkness reigns, and "all cows look black." Hence as the salt must not lose its savour that men may eat and live, the light must not cease to burn that darkness may not bring the night which is death, and where all distinctions are blotted out. In words so great spoken to such men madness may seem to lurk, but the madness is divine and breathes the inspiration of God. For only one thing has been greater than the words — their fulfilment. The disciples of Jesus have been "the salt of the earth"; they are, indeed, "the light of the world."

2. The questions now concern the person and the conduct of the Redeemer, and the controversies, which had hitherto felt hot under foot, now visibly burn. The reasons for the persecution are here disclosed, and we can almost hear the voices of the adversaries framing their bitter charge. They had said of Jesus,

He was a revolutionary who wanted only to destroy; and they had expatiated on His presumption over against the meekness of Moses whose law was said to be eternal and immutable. They had shut Him out of the kingdom as One who had not only broken the commandments Himself, but had taught men to break them. They had emphasized His obscurity and their own preëminence; had contrasted their obedience with His neglect, for while they had both pointed to heaven and led the way, He had done neither. They were clothed in a perfect righteousness, while He sat by the wayside a blind and tattered beggar, who had no status on earth and could have no place in heaven. On the basis of these accusations He had been persecuted; and persecution, as it had been His, would also be the lot of His disciples. It is to fortify them against it that He is teaching them the truth.

3. He begins therefore by defining His relation to "the law and the prophets." These He has not come "to destroy, but to fulfil." Destruction is a primitive passion; it is the first impulse of the wayward child or the revolutionary man, who hates the existing order as tyrannical and would fain reduce it to the ruins which he fancies would be at once its fittest tomb and finest monument. The particular man meant was as common then as now; then he was known as a sinner, a breaker or despiser of the law, to-day he is named a Nihilist. But Jesus was not such a person; He, like God, knew that the way to the most radical revolution lay through evolution; that "to destroy" was but to play into the hands of the tyrant who would preserve the expedient custom even though it should corrupt the world, and so He followed the divine method. He abolished by fulfilment, created by developing, by educing the higher from the lower. What they

expected Him to do was "to destroy the law and the prophets"; what they charged Him with doing was what they expected Him to do. That is a way men have; they give a person a bad name, and then condemn him for being as bad as the name they have given. What Jesus really did was "not to destroy, but to fulfil."

But did He mean by this phrase that He was to be the antitype of all the ancient types, the universal sacrifice for human transgression, the everlasting scapegoat, bearing from the face of God into a darksome wilderness the sins of the world? Did He mean that "to fulfil the prophets" was to allegorize sacred history and substitute one ephemeral fact for another? This was not Jesus' own interpretation, which implied a twofold principle. (i) That "the law" and "the prophets" must be understood in the same sense; (ii) and their fulfilment as also alike. "The law" and "the prophets" differ indeed as God does, who clothes Himself now in darkness and now in light; yet they are unified by Him, and are one as He and truth are one; He is light moving into darkness through the gloaming, and He is darkness breaking by imperceptible shades into light. His will is enforced in "law," He Himself is interpreted in "prophecy." The two are different in points of view as God is, whose will is "law," but His reason is truth. There is nothing in either "law" or "prophecy" Christ did not "fulfil"; in saving man He did the will of God, and so satisfied Him; in teaching men how and what to think of God, He showed the Father, and therefore pleased the Fatherhood in heaven.

IV

The third session exhibits the authority of Jesus as equal to Moses', on whose law He improves.*

1. We must remember how many-sided "the law" was to the Jew, though he held all its sides to be divine. But the "law" Jesus here speaks against is the law as it lived in tradition and the schools, not as embodied in the temple and its worship; the law as the scribe and not as the priest understood it, as it related to murder, to adultery, to swearing, to retaliation, to the regulation of man's conduct to man and his obedience towards God, and not as it concerned the service of the altar and the sacrifices. This is the only sense that fits this argument and the questions that emerged in the Galilean ministry. Instead of our division into the moral and the ceremonial law the Jews had another distinction more real and logical, though possibly made less consciously into the law as regulative of worship and the law as regulative of conduct, the distinction which was embodied in the two governing sects, the law as regulative of worship in the Sadducees, the law as regulative of conduct in the Pharisees. Their notions of the law differed also, though in the one case the law lived, in the other it was dead. The dead law was purely conservative and local; its home was Jerusalem, and it served its end by maintaining the priesthood and regulating their ritual. But the living law was progressive and national or racial; its home was the school and the synagogue; it grew daily in both urgency and size, drew into its net all the acts and all the thoughts of men and spread over all an equal sense of obligation; it so made the little

* v. 21–48.

great and the great little that to enlarge by a cubit a Sabbath day's journey was held to be as heinous a sin as to form a graven image and name it God. Hence came the maxim that "to offend in one point was to be guilty of all."* It was the law in this Pharisaic sense that Jesus spoke against. He proposes to supersede its outward regulations by realizing a more absolute sovereignty of God and a purer obedience by men. And so "the law" is placed in association with "the prophets" to denote the Divine ideal of Holy Writ, which He has "come to fulfil," i.e. to translate into reality, to teach man how to live a life God approves, and to show him the face of the approving God. No sanction of this law nor any of its duties will He relax, for it is the law of holiness. The sinlessness of Jesus is the fittest commentary on His words.

2. From the statement of the idea He passes to a classification of the authorities who teach the law and interpret the prophets. There are those who break the commandments of God and teach men to do the same; and there are those who by obeying teach obedience.† The first class are those from whom Jesus has suffered yet learned — "the scribes and the Pharisees." From the outset they "took counsel against Him, how they might destroy Him."‡ They charged Him with "casting out devils by the prince of the devils."§ His most characteristic teaching was an offence to them;|| they found fault with His disciples for not washing "their hands when they eat bread," and thus transgressing "the tradition of the elders."¶ They tempted Him,** and He had to warn the disciples against their "heaven."†† The hardest things He said against anybody

* James ii. 10. † v. 19. ‡ xii. 14; cf. xxii. 15.
§ ix. 34; xii. 24. || xv. 12. ¶ xv. 2.
** xvi. 1; xix. 3; xxii. 35. †† xvi. 6, 11.

of men He said against them; they were "hypocrites," "blind guides," "sons of hell"; they neglected "the weightier matters of the law," "strained out the gnat" and "swallowed the camel"; they were "whited sepulchres," "built the tombs of the righteous," yet proved themselves "the sons of them that slew the prophets."* And here His words are at once severe and benevolent. He dislikes those who teach as "precepts of God" the "commandments of men."† Their mistake is indeed common; the less divine a precept is in substance the more it needs the Divine authority to commend it; it is for their curses rather than their blessings that men invoke the sanction of God. But while Jesus speaks severely of this profanity, yet He will not exclude from the kingdom the men who are guilty of it. Their piety may be real, for they aim at pleasing God; but of all possible forms of piety theirs seems the poorest. Hence, He says, their place shall agree with their character, their status shall be in accordance with their conduct; they "shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven"; His temper lost its mildness and His words became fiercer when He had more experience of their zeal in shutting the kingdom against men.‡

3. The second class are they who teach and illustrate in their own conduct obedience towards God; they "shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." These are the men He would make; and upon His own His demands are higher than His rebukes were severe to His opponents. He does not deny that the Pharisees are righteous according to their own ideas; but their ideas are not His, and it is the ideas rather than the men that He opposes. While He does not judge them as they have judged Him, yet He will so judge His own as to require that they be worthy of Him.

* xxiii. 13–36. † xv. 9; cf. Ex. ii. 22. ‡ xxiii. 13.

The Pharisaic heaven may be an agreeable home to Pharisaic men, but His kingdom stands open only to those who have attained His righteousness. Hence comes the remarkable transitional verse, the conclusion from what precedes, the text of what follows: "For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." *

4. Jesus defines His meaning by examples, especially as regards the two cardinal points which had been raised in the earlier hours of the session, (i) His own relation to "the law and the prophets," or the religion of Israel, and the higher righteousness which He requires. (ii) What He requires at once exceeds and supersedes the righteousness of "the scribes and Pharisees."

(i) These things are in reality not two, but one and the same. This unity may be described as fufilment by realization, or supersession of the law by the attainment of its ethical ideal. Jesus shows by His examples that the law could not produce a moral man, for its most urgent personal and social precepts were either not moral in themselves or had received an immoral interpretation. Its precepts concerned the regulation of outward things, and could not reach or purify the inner sources of action. His purpose was to get at the man within, and by changing him change his world and the order to which he belonged. He does not question or deny the fitness of the law for its own time, place, and functions; on the contrary, His argument would uphold its occasional worth, while denying universality and permanence to its form. Hence the examples of Jesus, especially as illuminated by His supplementary illustrations, are intended to show how

* v. 20.

potent evil may be in the man whose conduct is governed by law, and how impotent law may be to correct and eradicate the evil.

(ii) He begins with an example affecting the sanctity of human life, and therefore fundamental to all social order. Murder. The law said, "Thou shalt not kill"; * but it did not forbid and it could not curb anger, which is the mother of the murderous passion. His second example is adultery. The law said, "Thou shalt not be guilty of it," or "covet thy neighbour's wife";† but it left the lust, which is its source, to rage and ravin unchecked within. His third example is divorce. The law said, if a man's wife finds no favour in his sight, he may give her "a bill of divorcement" and put her away;‡ but Jesus says, let marriage be inviolate, save because of adultery, for the woman has the same rights as the man. The fourth example is swearing. The law said, "If thou shalt vow a vow unto God, thou shalt perform it";§ but Jesus says, "Swear not at all; whatsoever is more than yea, yea, or nay, nay, is sin." The fifth is the *lex talionis*. The law said, "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth";‖ but for it Jesus would substitute the law of compensation and service. The sixth and final example is taken from man's pitilessness in the struggle for life, personal and national. Do not say, let us love our neighbours and hate our enemies;¶ but instead, "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you."

* Ex. xx. 13; Lev. xxix. 17; Deut. v. 17.

† Ex. xx. 14, 17; Lev. xviii. 20; xx. 10; Deut. v. 17.

‡ Deut. xxiv. 1.

§ Deut. xxiii. 21–4; cf. Lev. xix. 12; Num. xxx. 2–4.

‖ Ex. xxi. 24; Deut. xix. 21; Lev. xxiv. 19–20.

¶ Lev. xix. 18. Jesus here represents the possible spirit not the actual teaching of the Law. Yet the extermination of the heathen dwellers in the promised land may justify the words.

5. And here He rises to the height of His argument and shows us why He thinks as He does and why man ought to think in the same way. Humanity is everywhere rooted in Deity; we cannot fulfil any duty towards man unless we think rightly concerning God. If we are His sons, it becomes us to be god-like in temper and in character; and to interpret law through Him rather than Him through law. If this is our principle, then we shall never be satisfied with a stereotyped law delivered to men of untutored mind and savage mood; but shall ever seek to raise our interpretation of law as our notion of God rises. And this is what Jesus here attempts to do. He says, in effect, — God does what becomes Himself; and as He is good, the good is what He delights to do. Men may be His enemies, but He does not therefore cease to be their friend. On the contrary, "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good; He sendeth His rain on the just and the unjust."* To love only those who love us is to be as the publicans, and not as the Father in heaven. To hate man is but to hate God; the last thing we can do is to justify our hate by His love. But if we thus think of God, why speak of Him in awed breathlessness and under an awful and august name? To conceive Him as Father is to see the barriers of race and colour and culture fall down, and men stand face to face with each other as brothers. And so Jesus ends His discussion of His revised second table of the law with a sentence which turns the highest truth in theology into the ultimate principle in ethics: "Ye ought to be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."†

* v. 45. † v. 48.

V

In the fourth session the theme of discussion is "the kingdom," conceived as an institution for the worship of God.

The laws which regulate this worship are expressed in a general term or principle, "righteousness"* and in three specific forms: almsgiving,† prayer,‡ and fasting.§ For the proper appreciation of the argument two things must be remembered. (i) It is concerned with the worship of the synagogue and not of the temple, of Galilee and not of Jerusalem, of the scribe and not of the priest. This limitation is necessitated by the experience and history of Jesus. (ii) The principles here applied to the special problem are identical with those stated and illustrated in the previous sessions, (*α*) the invisibility of the things God most values, and (*β*) the inexorable agreement of act and award. These principles are here affirmed with iterative emphasis. The disciples are not to do their righteousness or their worship "before men," neither to give alms, nor to pray nor to fast that they "may be seen of men." If they act thus, "they have received their reward," and can have none from their "Father who is in heaven."|| The act which owes all its merit to what the eye of God alone can see is profaned by publicity. Hence we have phrases like "the poor *in spirit*" and "the pure *in heart*," and an argument intended to prove the folly of attempting by outer laws to govern inward states; the prohibitions to kill, to commit

* vi. 1. "Righteousness" — δικαιοσύνη — is a word which our Authorized Version, confounding interpretation with translation, here renders "alms" (cf. Deut. xxiv. 13; Ps. lxii. 9). The Revised Version is more literal, and renders "your righteousness."

† 2–4. ‡ 5–15. § 16–18. || vi. 1, 2, 5, 16.

adultery, to swear, or the demand of "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," are not religious or moral laws, but positive and civil. They instituted and administered a civil order, did not constitute a religious society or turn the State they founded into a church. Such a civil order, expressed in laws of conduct, tends to formalism; or expressed in the laws which govern worship tends to ceremonialism. The disciples envied, as the poor ever will, the riches that could be counted and they could handle; and so they came to admire ostentation which is the vice of the vulgar rich, and the ceremonialism which is the vice of the vulgar in religion. But Jesus here seeks to suppress these vices by evoking the opposite virtues and by teaching men to look with the eyes of God upon life as a whole, but especially upon conduct and worship. While righteousness is prescribed of God, worship is realized by men; and of such worship alms-giving was, to the Jew, a necessary element.

A. 1. Jesus says, therefore, that they are not when they give alms* to sound a trumpet before them; that may be ostentation, but it is not benevolence; it may attract the multitude who like not to give, but to see what is given, as well as the notice of those who prefer to ask rather than to tell; but it will not please God, who loves a cheerful more than a public giver. The words of Jesus here may seem more negative than positive, but the most positive principles lived within this negative form. Nor must we forget that these early are not His final words, or even His weightiest and most influential utterance. Philanthropy was His creation; the

* vi. 2. Our Authorized Version, which is here simply correct and faithful, translates "When thou doest thine alms." The distinction between "right-cousness" and "alms" is that between a general principle, which is one, and a special act, which is one out of many.

good Samaritan was in this field His ideal man; the church He founded became the first, the greatest, and the most efficient of all charitable agencies because of the inspiration partly of His example and partly of His words: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one, even the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me." *

2. But He has not yet reached the period either when He could say these things, or when they could be understood. He speaks to disciples, who are but children disguised as men. And here we must note where the words stand: as the first in the new session they are connected with the last in the old. There He had said: "man ought to be like God, and love all men irrespective of character or race"; here he says: "this love ought to be expressed in a service as secret as God's, whose left hand does not know what His right hand does"; our love ought to be uttered as spontaneously as His, without any challenge either to ourselves or to another to come, observe, and admire our generosity. Charity, like God, is too holy for ostentation, pomp, ceremonial. "Almsgiving" indeed had come to have a sort of assured place in the worship of Israel. The Mosaic legislation was too benevolent to recognize so depraved a thing as begging, — for which the Hebrew tongue may be said to have no term; † but as "the poor were never to cease out of the land," special provision was made for them, and the open hand was commended as a thing the Lord would bless. ‡ Job only speaks the language of the pious Hebrew when he claims to have been "a father to

* Matt. xxv. 40.

† But see Psalm cix. 10.

‡ Deut. xv. 7–11. Cf. the laws as to the tithing of the increase, Deut. xiv. 28–29; as to gleaning, Deut. xxiv. 19–21; Lev. xix. 9–10; Ruth ii. 2–19; and as to the Sabbatic year and the year of jubilee, Lev. xxv. As regards the New Testament, cf. Matt. xxiii. 11; Mark xiv. 7; John xii. 8.

the poor";* and it is but a fundamental maxim of the religion to say: "He that hath pity on the poor lendeth unto the Lord."† Post-exilic Judaism made almsgiving an act of worship;‡ and the more the legal spirit grew the more this duty was emphasized.§ The dispersion created a class which the industrialism of the ancient homeland did not know, and the assemblies in the synagogues were used to raise funds not simply for the temple, but for the poor. What it had become the Pharisee of the parable shows us; in the remarkable catalogue of virtues which he recites, giving "tithes of all he gets" stands alongside "fasting." ||

3. This custom is no substitute for the neighbourliness Jesus commands, and so He condemns its opposite, which does not spring from love, and is without its universality; therefore it lives only within special communities, recognizes distinctions of race, seeks honour for the giver rather than for God. He does not mean to speak against organized, but against ostentatious charity; what He dislikes is the act which depraves both giver and receiver. The trumpet which went before the donor invited the attention not only of the spectators but of the would-be recipients; it forced them to feel their poverty, and seek gratuitous relief without shame; to lose the honesty and self-respect without which man can know neither dignity nor independence. A pauperized poor signifies an impoverished and deteriorated people; and so Jesus hated the public charity that meant the enhancement of one man's reputation at the expense of the common character. So He bade them give alms in secret,

* xxix. 16. † Prov. xix. 17.

‡ Paul uses a favourite word with him, "righteousness" = δικαιοσύνη in its late Jewish sense (2 Cor. ix. 9; cf. Psalm cxii. 9). Hence it is combined with "mercy" (Prov. xxi. 21; Tob. ii. 14), and the man who realizes these "findeth life."

§ Tob. iv. 8; xii. 8; Sir. iii. 3; xxix. 12. || Luke xviii. 12.

let not the giver know what he bestowed or the receiver what he got; it was enough that God in His heaven knew. With His knowledge man ought to be satisfied. The principle was far-reaching and simple, yet hard to be understood. If His church had only understood it we should have been saved from those theories of penance and satisfaction which have gone far to turn Christianity into Judaism.

B. 1. As with almsgiving, so with prayer; a second element of "righteousness" or worship of God, or piety according to Judaism. The reference is in each case introduced in the same way, and constructed so far on the same lines. The disciples are not to pray like "the hypocrites," the men who are play-actors even in their devotions, and who love to perform in the synagogues and at the corners of the streets "that they may be seen of men." This is the thing they have sought, and it is the only answer they get. There is a prayer that can be offered in public, but it must be offered by the public. Prayer by the people may be as real as prayer by a person; but the people must be unified, personalized, formed as into a single soul speaking its desires into the ear of God. But the prayer here is personal, and crowds can only hinder it.* When man would speak to God, He must be conscious only of God and himself; if any other being intrudes into consciousness, then the sense of standing alone with God is lost. The words spoken for another to hear may fully reveal the man; but this is a revelation God does not need to have made, for He knows it already. The thing He does desire to know is what the man in his heart of hearts best loves and most seeks. In order to this the man must enter his closet

* Cf. the invitation of God to "shut thy doors about thee" (Isa. xxvi. 21); the conduct of Elijah (2 Kings iv. 33).

and shut his door, that he may by shutting the world out shut himself up to God and there speak the secrets of his soul.

2. But when the Master had come thus far a hearer who had not yet forgotten the brave actions and bold words of the Baptist cried out: "Sir, teach us to pray, even as John also taught his disciples."* And Jesus graciously expanded His

* The words which are taken from Luke xi. 1 are there at once followed by the Lucan version of the Lord's Prayer, which thus does not stand in the sermon in Luke. And many things seem to indicate that this section in Matthew does not belong to the original *Logia*. It differs from the rest in style and structure. The clauses which precede are each introduced by ὅταν, which is an adverb of time—while here the introductory word is a plural participle (προσευχόμενοι). The singular makes way for the plural, and thus the persons who sin are changed; "the hypocrites" are superseded by "the heathen"; and the sins are also changed βατταλοξ. γήσητε, explained later by πολυλογία, of "much speaking," instead of the God who sees in secret and His open reward. And the paragraph which had begun with a reference to privacy as the condition of immediacy in prayer ends with what, viewed in relation to the argument and purpose of the section, seems a totally irrelevant exhortation to forgiveness. Then the section which succeeds begins (*v.* 16) with the omitted ὅταν, and at 17–18 the singular is again resumed, while structure and argument agree with those of 2–4 and 5–6. Because of these differences certain scholars have argued that the Lord's Prayer as given in Matthew, though in substance accurate and authentic, is yet an interpolation; and many have also argued that Luke has preserved its form and marked its place more exactly than Matthew. We recognize the difference, but explain it otherwise. We hold that Matthew has not only had fuller *logia* than Luke, but has understood and used them better. Luke has been more guided than Matthew by the subjective canons of literary tact and taste, and has in obedience to these dealt more freely with his *logia*, which were briefer than Matthew's, breaking them up and incorporating the fragments in what he judged to be their correct historical setting. Hence he gives the prayer as the reply of Jesus to the question of one who recalled the method of John—in this we think he is true to his source—but he places it at a period too late in the ministry of Jesus to fit the circumstances. It stands just after the incident of Martha and Mary and just before a parable, neither of which Matthew knows; while it is followed, after an extract (Luke xi. 9–13) from Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (vii. 7–11), by events which Matt. xii. 22–30 and Mark iii. 22–27 agree with Luke in placing late in the Galilean ministry. If,

discourse to deal with the special and peculiar difficulty of this man. For the moment the Pharisees fell out of the discussion, and the antithesis was supplied by "the Gentiles." Galilee had a mixed population; much of its evil reputation in Judæa was due to the heathen among its inhabitants. And so the Gentiles were brought in to point a moral in this matter of prayer.

3. The Galileans knew Mount Carmel, and could read in their history how in the face of the prophet's challenge the priests of Baal had shouted from morning till noon, "O Baal, hear us!"* So Jesus says, "Be not like unto heathen men"; "remember your God is no blind and dumb idol"; "your Father knoweth what things you have need of before you ask Him." Speak, therefore, as unto a God who sees and knows. Address Him as (i) "Our Father." Jesus does not attempt to define Fatherhood or to raise any discussion concerning it; He simply desires to let the name creep into the study of imagination, modify their faith, and affect their conduct. (ii) "Which art in heaven," He says. The formula is familiar, yet it takes a new meaning on His lips. "Heaven" is the abode of God, where He dwells in eternal serenity, whence He broods over earth like a gracious bosom which enfolds all and hears all, and whence He looks like the single eye which at once sees and illuminates and beautifies by day,

then, there has been any dislocation, we are inclined to hold Luke responsible for it, and to argue that though he misplaced the prayer he correctly recorded its occasion. One of those who had forsaken John to follow Jesus was so intensely interested in the subject of prayer that he interrupted the Master to ask the question; and the Evangelist, according to his custom, gives here the Master's answer without referring to the disciple's question.

* Kings xviii. 26; cf. Acts xix. 34, where another concourse of heathen men cried out, "all with one voice, about the space of two hours, Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

or the myriad eyes that as stars break and glorify the darkness of the night. (iii) "Hallowed be Thy Name." The holier God seems the more awful He becomes. The familiarity which breeds contempt is familiarity with the evil or the common; the more intimately man knows the eternal Father, the more humble and filial he will grow. The only majesty of God is moral majesty; to make physical omnipotence the synonym of God is but to deify brute force. The devil invested with the might of the Almighty would be the most hateful of all possible devils, for mere strength could never make Satan into "the ever blessed God." (iv) "Thy kingdom come." His is the kingdom, and it is good and holy as He is. It has come and is coming; it lives in time, yet belongs to eternity. Its temporal being is an everlasting moment. The only realities that never wither are the idealities that are ever in process of realization; the only eternal is what is about to be. (v) "Thy will be done on earth as in heaven." The will, like the God whose might it is, is paternal, gracious, moral; where it is done man is righteous, and earth is turned into heaven.

4. So far the prayer has been concerned with the things of God; now it takes up the concerns of man, coördinating these in a series of connected clauses into what seems a coherent whole. (i) "Give us this day our daily bread." Jesus does not teach us to pray for riches, for the comforts or the superfluities of life; but for its necessaries, which this prayer transforms from the means of living into means of grace. Existence is good, and so are the things needed for its maintenance; but when luxuries become necessaries existence is depraved rather than dignified. Nor are we bidden to pray that we may be poor or ascetic; but simply for the bread we cannot live without, though we may be unable to live by it alone. This is prayer in the Spirit of

Christ, which is the only sense in which this can be turned into a prayer in His Name. (ii) "And forgive us our debts, as we have forgiven our debtors." Here we pass from the physical to the spiritual realm, which Jesus conceives as distinct indeed, but as constituting a unity. Body and soul are opposites, but not contraries; the same God made both, and they ought to be mentioned together in our daily prayer. Yet there is a significant difference between the two; we must ask that to the body bread be given, and to the soul its acts or faults be forgiven. But even between these faults there is a significant distinction. Luke says "our sins" (*τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν*); Matthew says "our debts" (*τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν*). The terms differ while they agree; "sins" concern God, and can only be figuratively related to man; "debts" are due to man, and can be used of our relation to God only in a figure. Then sins are broader as well as deeper than debts. The man who sins acts against nature as well as against God; but the man who incurs "debt" has failed to fulfil the obligations of honesty and honour. The point where both terms meet may be the idea of unfulfilled duties; "our sins" are conceived as undischarged dues, "our debts" as failures in obedience, violations of the law of God.

Yet the difference, such as it is, belongs to the translations, not to the original. Jesus used but one Aramaic word, which the translators represented by two Greek terms. Luke, trained in the school of Paul, prefers *ἁμαρτία*; Matthew, a Jew, who had studied the Hebrew prophets, *ὀφείλημα*. Yet the equivalence of "sin" and "debt" has been something worse than a dubious good for Christian thought. There is no term that can so little express the relations of the guilty creature to the Creator as "debt." It has been used to deaden conscience and to silence reason, to

justify vicious theories of vicarious penalty, and to identify arbitrary right with absolute sovereignty. The sins we ask God to forgive represent a guilt which cannot be discharged by any legal quittance, or transferred to another soul than our own. Hence there is added a condition of forgiveness we can fulfil, and no other: "as we also have forgiven our debtors." The gift as God offers it may be conditioned on faith; as we beseech it, it is conditioned on obedience. The attitude of the giver is one, of the receiver another; he who asks God to forgive must appear to Him as a soul that can be forgiven. (iii) "And lead us not into temptation." The one petition concerned the past, the other concerns the future. The man whose sins are forgiven must not be forward to sin. God does not seduce to evil; the seduction of innocence is a work which only a thoroughly bad being, careless of another's good, could attempt. To ask God not to "lead us into temptation" is a potent means of keeping out of it. The man in good moral health is certain to be incapable of acts which are congenial to moral feebleness. The strong can bear the infirmities of the weak because so unconscious of their own. (iv) "But deliver us from evil." This only amplifies the finer petition; the man incapable of being tempted is freed from sin. And so the prayer ends as simply as it had opened; the man delivered from evil is a son of God and lives unto Him.

But though the prayer is ended, the character of the man whose question called it forth stands clearly outlined before the imagination of the Master. And so He returns to the point the man most needed to have emphasized. "Forgive us as we have forgiven," is a hard petition to utter; yet it is cardinal, and without it the prayer would be vain. So Peter, now as ever the speaker, was, because of his impul-

sive and wayward temper, quick to say strong things against those who had offended him. Later he inquired: "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Until seven times?" And Jesus answered: "Until seventy times seven."* This is the lesson which the prayer teaches to every man: "Forgive us as we have forgiven."

C. 1. The custom of fasting was deeply rooted in human nature, and well known in all the religions of the East. The cult of the ascetic is an ancient element in Brahmanism, and Mohammed made the fast an integral practice of his religion. The Mosaic legislation enforced it during the great day of atonement; it was to be "a perfect Sabbath," in which men were to afflict their souls.† The practice grew, now encouraged, now discouraged by the prophets;‡ and in the days of Jesus it had become a sign of the severer piety, since the Pharisaic custom was to "fast twice in the week,"§ once for the ascent and once for the descent of Moses at Sinai.

2. Here Jesus comes face to face with the custom which He censures as a mechanical method for the expression of inward contrition. He warns His disciples against the "sad countenance" and the "disfigured face" of the "hypocrites" who want men to see that they "fast." He bids them "anoint the head and wash the face," that the fasting may not be seen of man, but of God alone. These were His earliest words on this theme, and they were tentative; later He became, in both speech and conduct, more decisive. The disciples of John and the Pharisees fasted often and much, while His did not; and

* Matt. xviii. 21–22; cf. Mark xi. 25–26.
† Lev. 29–31; xxiii. 28–32; Num. xxix. 7.
‡ Cf. Joel i. 14; ii. 12–15; Zach. vii. 5; Isa. lviii. 3–7.
§ Luke xviii. 12.

He was asked, why.* His answer was twofold: (i) they could not fast in His society any more than "the children of the bridechamber" could mourn in the presence of "the Bridegroom"; and (ii) they could not put a new patch on an old garment, or new wine in old skins, without increasing the damage of the old garment and the old skins. What He means is obvious enough. He brings joy, not sorrow. Where He comes He ought to be received not with the bowed head and the sad face, but with the smile that greets the celestial Bridegroom. The methods of mechanical devotion, the cultivation of the outward form, for its own sake, may be suitable to the old, but is quite inappropriate to the new. Pour the living Spirit into the ancient custom, and the custom will explode; the new wine will burst the old bottle, and both bottle and wine be lost. The soul is not made for the body, but the body for the soul; he who would confine a new soul to an old body would make the outward lord over the inward, and matter the sovereign of mind. "There are celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial";† man's passion may be the preservation of the "body terrestrial"; Christ's desire is to create the new Spirit, and then to let "God give it a body, even as it pleaseth Him."

VI

In the fifth session "the kingdom" is conceived through God, its Founder and Head, or in its fundamental idea and ultimate purpose.‡

1. Some scholars think that this section breaks the continuity of the sermon; but though there is, as respects thought and style, a gap between the preceding portion

* Matt. ix. 14–17; Mark ii. 18–22; Luke v. 33–39.
† 1 Cor. xv. 38, 39. ‡ Matt. v. 19–34.

and this, yet there is a larger unity which could not be without the smaller.* The fifth session is divided from the fourth as the second is from the first, but only as sections, where a subjective transition is represented in an objective form. The new thought begins in each case in the same way, with the prohibition of an inference drawn by the hearers, partly from what they have heard in the discussions on the Hill, and partly from what they had learned in the synagogue or from the Pharisees. The prohibition† was, in the one case, intellectual, an appeal to thought, μὴ νομίσητε: — "Do not think or infer from what has been said by Me or about Me that I am come to destroy."‡ The prohibition, § in the other case, is emotional, a command to the heart, μὴ θησαυρίζετε: — "Do not, in spite of what people say I have said, or you yourselves may judge as to My purpose, store up treasures upon earth."|| Jesus here rises into a serener air than He had yet breathed. He ceases to concern Himself directly with the Pharisaic polemic, and discusses rather His main idea as embodied in the mind and conduct of men. The key of the section occurs in the phrase: "Seek ye first the kingdom and the righteousness of God."¶ "The kingdom" is collective and objective, "the righteousness" subjective and personal. Both are of God; He institutes the one and He prescribes the other; the kingdom denotes the law man ought to obey, the righteousness the obedience which realizes the law. Jesus, as Matthew understands Him, means by "His righteousness" a righteousness which God has revealed in His law with Paul; it means a righteousness revealed in the gospel. Unity is secured by both apostles

* Loisy, e.g. speaks of verses 19–21 as "a sentence complete in itself and independent of its context" — *Le Discours sur La Montagne.*

† Matt. x. 17. ‡ v. 17. § Mark vi. 19.

|| vi. 19. ¶ vi. 33.

conceiving righteousness as proceeding from God; but with Matthew it is what God prescribes and requires; with Paul it is what He provides and describes.* In Matthew it expresses an authority which enforces obedience; in Paul it expresses the Divine will or grace conditioned, as regards its effects, on faith. Matthew conceived righteousness as conformity to the will of God as expressed in His law; Paul conceived the same will as incarnated in Jesus Christ. Hence the evangelist describes it in legal and abstract terms, the apostolical correspondence in terms personal and concrete; and both agree in affirming that without it there can be no acceptance of man with God. The only righteousness which Matthew knows comes then from doing His will. The only righteousness which Paul knows comes from belief of the truth. Law is objective, and righteousness is its subjective counterpart; what therefore the law enjoins the gospel incorporates; law is righteousness articulated in precepts, and righteousness is law impersonated in character. But this general sense of righteousness splits in these sessions into two quite distinct special senses — the Pharisaic or legal, and the Christian or evangelical. In the one case the righteousness corresponds to the outward or rabbinical law; in the other case, to the kingdom which Jesus preaches and institutes.

"The kingdom" thus stands in the mind of Jesus opposed to the Mosaic State which the Pharisee glorified; "the righteousness," to the eternal conformity which the Pharisaic teaching tended to produce. And these notions He here presents not in relation to the law and worship, but to the man and his life. Hence He says in effect: "You are poor men, you have the passion of the poor for wealth, for calculable good, for corruptible riches; but the only riches

* Rom. i. 17; iii. 21–26; x. 3–4; Phil. iii. 9.

which the moth cannot eat, or rust ruin, or the thief steal, are those that are laid up in heaven. Set your affection on things above and not on things below, and this unity in the objects loved will create unity in the love; for "where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." But you are also men who reason; you have eyes that were made to see, and the most entrancing of all possible moments for you is the vision of God. And what hinders this vision? Inner conflicts, the passion of sense, which by clinging to the visible hide the invisible, and turn the light within into a double and deplorable darkness. And is not this passion for the seen the cause of the Pharisaic idea of righteousness? and is not the cause of the worship that can be seen of man the desire to store up treasures upon the earth? Do not think that you can obey at once the visible and the invisible, so worship as to be at the same time seen of men and approved of God. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon."*

2. Jesus, then, here pleads for unity in the objects a man loves and thinks of, for only so can unity exist in his mind and life. He cannot be happy if he tries to serve two incompatibles, or if — for this is the same thing — he attempts to pacify a nature made for the service of the higher graces by indulgence in the lower passions. We tend to think of the worship of Mammon as the worship of wealth by the wealthy man, who worships in the city; or as a mere fetish like the Exchange, where competing brokers gather to speculate in shares, which here mean the comforts and the fortunes of innumerable simple lives; or some place like the warehouse where the buyer seeks to trade with the seller concerning the produce of multitudinous cunning but ill-remunerated hands. But if this had been Jesus' idea,

* vi. 19.

would He have warned His poverty-stricken disciples against such service? To Him the man who earned a daily wage could serve Mammon as easily as the man who speculated in stocks and shares. To do so he had only to will to do all things for himself, to be his own Providence and govern his life as it pleased him, as if there were no God in heaven. He might express with his lips a belief in the eternal, but he lived in time as if there were no other factor in time save the will incorporated in his person. Such a man may give God thanks while he lives, as though God were not.

The worship of Mammon is thus as possible to the poor man as to the rich, to the workman as to the millionaire, to the son of industry as to the child of luxury; it is but to live as if there were no God while by lip and by speech we profess to think He is. The forms it may assume are infinite. A late distinguished continental scholar once said to me: "The most characteristic words in a language are those no term in any other language can translate, for they are the words that express the ideas most distinctive of the people who speak the language. Now the most characteristic word of your English tongue and people, without an equivalent in any tongue I know, is 'comfort.' The idea and the term you alone possess." In that saying there was humiliation as well as instruction; the names for our higher ideas, "God," "the soul," "freedom," "immortality," can be translated; but no term in any tongue can translate a term so steeped in the new type of Materialism as "comfort." Yet our most characteristic ideas are those we most love. Suppose, then, we use the word here and simply say, "Ye cannot serve God and comfort," would the saying be false, and could it be said to express the mind of Jesus? The man who worships "comfort" worships care;

the more servants wait upon him the greater the number of anxieties that come thronging in their train. And it paralyzes the soul and numbs its very feeling for higher things. Let us think of the woman who has soft carpets under her feet, maids to anticipate her every want and take out of her hands the labours of the day and relieve her brain from all effort at thought. She lies on her sofa and reads the last new novel, shedding bitter tears over the imaginary sorrows of the heroine, yet they are sorrows she is too indolent to imagine for herself and must have imagined for her, and relate to some forsaken girl or some wronged and disappointed man. Below in her own kitchen, or in the slums whose gaunt outlines lie in the shadow of her stately mansion, darker and more gruesome dramas are daily enacted and tragedies performed by men and women of real flesh and blood. Her very comfort has made her selfish, and turned into veritable darkness the light that ought to have burned bright within her! There is nothing that so increases sorrow as the comfort that comes without labour, the wealth that knows no duty, and the selfish ease which has no need save that of being ministered unto. But God is duty and duty is God. And so the woman who is so active in the ministries of common life as to have no time to waste on imaginary sorrows has a strength and a joy that her idler and softer sister can never know. The unity in thought and feeling which Jesus pleads for means the beatitude of the dutiful, who have forsaken the service of Mammon for the richer service of God.

3. But Jesus does not simply state His principle; He applies and illustrates it. There is a finer touch of autobiography in this section than in any other words of Jesus.*

* vi. 24–34.

They could have been spoken by no man familiar only with the gaunt houses, the high walls, or the mean life of an Oriental city; by a man who had not wandered through green fields, watched the birds of the air as they soared and sang, the springing grass, the golden corn whitening unto the harvest, the flowers fragrant and beautiful, the lily, more modest and therefore more majestic in loveliness than "Solomon in all his glory." And man moving under the bounteous yet careless heaven over the fruit-laden and laboured yet ungrudging earth, is alone burdened with anxiety in all this happy world, ever asking the questions which Nature hears but to rebuke: "What shall I eat? What shall I drink? How and with what shall I be clothed?" No person in history was ever by nature less a Man of Sorrows than Jesus. Sorrow came to Him, but He did not come a sorrowful Man to men. He was no ascetic, no incarnate ideal of misery with a face of utter sickliness expressing deep disgust at life. He meant man to be happy both here and hereafter; His very miracles are best understood as parables which expressed this deep desire. He pitied the blind man who walked in darkness, and He loved to open his eyes to the light which was life. The deaf ear, inaccessible to the music which nature loves to pour into the listening soul; the paralyzed limbs which refuse to bear man whither he willed; the issue of blood which drained the strong of his strength and made the woman feel that under it her beauty was ebbing away; the hungry multitudes who fain would eat, and the thirsty thousands who craved for more water than any man could give — were people He loved to heal and to help. His pity was the outcome of His moral health, which could not bear to see either spiritual or physical disease.

In those early days Jesus had a rare radiance of soul which seems all the brighter because of the darkness that was to be. He knew the cares of the poor by experience, for had He not lived from His infancy in a carpenter's home, which was house and workshop in one? And had He not walked on the hills round Nazareth until He had learned the truths which Nature can teach the heart that loves her? So He bids the men who till the fields and eat their bread in the sweat of their brow "behold the birds of the heaven: they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns," yet they are fed and multiply. Why? It is God who feedeth them; but they do not leave all to God. There were no creatures so diligent in performing each day the duties proper to it. They never turn to-day into to-morrow, or bring to-morrow into to-day. In the springtime they pair and build their nests; in the early summer they feed and rear their young; and in the bright days that follow they add their own and their offsprings' gladness to the universal joy. When the hour of migration arrives, they muster in their multitudes and speed over the sea or across the desert to more congenial climes. The birds of the air carry a message which may be thus interpreted: "Leave the labours and the duties of to-morrow to to-morrow and to the God whose it is. To-day is man's, and in it he ought to do his work living in obedience to his conscience and to the Eternal God."

4. But inanimate nature has a voice as well as animate; the flowers of the field tell us that life is beautiful just as it is full of the energy of God. Care may limit His energy or mar His beneficence, while it can do nothing for man, neither add a cubit to his stature nor adorn him in rich apparel, though it may decrease his moral loveliness.

Burke deplored the French Revolution because he fancied that with it would disappear the ancient graces of manner, the fine breeding and refinement that caused vice, by losing all its grossness, to lose half its evil. It was replied to him that vice by looking daintier came no nearer virtue; on the contrary, what made it seem more attractive only added to its power. Vice, by losing all its grossness, may become more of a fine art; but no art can render what is born of the brute in man lest brutal. The hideous mien is the fit expression for moral deformity, which is but accentuated by every attempt to refine the hideous. The art of Jesus is higher; He would not try to refine the gilded life of the rich, but would rather ennoble and refine the grinding miseries of the poor. The lilies of the field neither toil nor spin, yet they have a grace which is of God; and will He thus clothe grass in beauty and neglect man? Let our chief quest be His kingdom and His righteousness, and the things we grieve over or become anxious about will all be added.* Jesus does not teach a quietude without thought and without will. He knew quite well that —

> Evil is wrought by want of thought
> As well as want of heart.

But the two wants are one and the same; want of thought is want of heart. Thoughtfulness is a virtue; thoughtlessness is a vice. A careless man is a man without merit, facing life without any sobering sense of responsibility. Jesus does not say, "The thoughtless is the excellent man," but, "Be not distracted, divided, drawn two ways at once by the fear of what may happen to-morrow. To-morrow is not yours, it is God's; for you it may never dawn at all, and if it does dawn God will come then, and be present then as

* v. 33–34.

He is now." He thus strikes at the most common cause of human care. It is the expected that troubles, and the expected never happens. We may anticipate various forms of death, but we do not die the death we anticipate. In imagination we fight an innumerable multitude of battles; in reality we fight comparatively few. And so Jesus says to the men seated round Him on the hill: "Do what all nature teaches, and have faith in God; make sure of His kingdom and righteousness; and leave to Him to-morrow and all the to-morrows yet to be."

VII

In the sixth session the subject is the kingdom reviewed and its duties restated and reënforced.

1. There is less unity in this section than in any of the preceding; and the lack of unity is reflected in the style, which is broken, didactic, such as may fitly serve up a chapter of fragments. Yet the fragments cohere when viewed in relation, on the one hand, to the speaker and the hearers, and, on the other hand, to the sermon as a whole. The section may be described as a review of the past discussions given in the form of answers to suppressed or unrecorded questions. The first question concerned the criticism of the law of retaliation,* which had been expressed in a way peculiarly distasteful to the natural man, who dearly loves to exact "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," and deeply resents being told: "Resist not him that is evil, and when smitten on the right cheek, turn the left." "What would you substitute for this law? Would it not effectively prevent your own retaliatory criticism of the Pharisees?" The reply of Jesus is remark-

* v. 38–42.

able.* He does not repeal His law, but repeats and re-enforces it: "Judge not, that ye be not judged"; but He adds a most significant supplement: "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you." What He means to say is: "I have criticized the Pharisees at My peril, and they have criticized Me at theirs; according to the principles on which I have judged them I shall be judged; their criticism of Me will be applied to themselves." This is in harmony with the eternal justice which either condemns or acquits a man out of his own mouth. Judgment is God's work, not man's; retaliation is too delicate an instrument for any hand but His; it is our part to make sure of the principles we judge others by, for God will inexorably apply them to ourselves. Then a second disciple intervenes: "You said that our righteousness must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees.† Now, are we to measure ours by theirs, or theirs by ours?" And Jesus replies:‡ "Do neither; measure both by the eternal law of God. Do not try to look at yourself through your neighbour, or at your neighbour through yourself; but cultivate the clear vision. Get the beam out of your own eye before you attempt to remove the mote from your brother's." A third questioner here rises and says: "We cannot get near the Pharisee, he is too proud to let us. How are we to prevent his haughtiness making us haughty?" And Jesus answers: § "Do not meet pride with pride, or anger with anger. The first consideration is not self, but truth; and the truth you believe is too holy to be cast in the face of the seriously insincere." Then a fourth hearer, more intent on his religious acts than on his neighbourly duties, breaks in with questions on prayer:

* vii. 1–2. † v. 20.
‡ vii. 3–5. § vii. 6.

How ought we to pray, and why? Are we sure that God will hear us? Jesus says:* "Ask, seek, knock; pray as if you needed, and would die unless you received. And as to God, have I not taught you to name Him, Our Father? And you who are fathers know that you could not give a son who asked for bread a stone. And will God who is good be worse than you who are evil?"

2. But Jesus learned from the disciples as well as the disciples from Jesus. The more He saw of man the further He saw into men; and so we find that at the end of this last session He became grave, concerned, admonitory. He had discovered that sympathy was one thing and conviction another; and that men who approve of the effort to strike the fetters from the soul may deeply disapprove of the obligations which in consequence lie upon it. And this, as He conceived matters, was a worse calamity. He had fancied that opposition to Pharisaic teaching signified acceptance of His own; but now He feared that there might be dislike of the bad without any correlative love of the good. And this new fear, which came from increased experience, finds a fourfold expression in the epilogue: (i) This fear is expressed in the parable of the two gates and the two ways, Jeremiah's "way of life and way of death,"† the one way narrow and steep, but leading to life, the other way broad and spacious, but leading to death;‡ (ii) in the warning against "false prophets," men who have put off the old raiment and put on the new without any corresponding change in themselves, who appear outwardly in sheep's clothing, "but inwardly are ravening wolves." And here He enforces and doubly emphasizes His famous law for the discovery of truth in the man: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

* vii. 7–11. † xxi. 8. ‡ Matt. vii. 13–14.

Jesus did not shrink from having this principle applied to Himself; He only stipulated that the man who applied it should himself be good. "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God or whether I speak from Myself."* (iii) In the admonition to beware of becoming false disciples, it is not enough to prophesy, to cast out devils, or do mighty works in His name; it is necessary to do the will of His Father in heaven. The outward note of name availeth nothing; the only thing that can avail is the inward spirit of obedience. And here He allows Himself to speak as the supreme authority in religion, the final Judge of quick and dead, who can send men away into the outer darkness with the awful words, "Depart from Me, ye that work iniquity." (iv) In a final parable which forecasts those that mark the end of His public ministry, He contrasts the wise and the unwise builder, the man who builds upon the rock a house that stands four-square to every wind that blows, and the man who builds upon the sand a house that tumbles into ruin when assailed by the waters of earth and the winds of heaven. There was little wonder that the multitudes as they descended from the hill spoke one to another with astonishment of His teaching, for He had taught them as one having "authority, and not as their scribes."

* John vii. 17.

V

"THE TEACHING OF JESUS" IN HIS MIDDLE PERIOD: THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH

THE teaching of Jesus in His middle period had certain characteristic elements and features: —

(*a*) As regards *matter* there is new and marked emphasis —

(i) on "the kingdom of heaven" or "God";*

(ii) on the person of Christ, marked by the emergence of the name "Son of Man";†

(iii) on such incidents and acts as the Cross, the death and its significance, and the resurrection.‡

(*β*) As regards *form* the period is remarkable —

(i) for its number of parables as well as the purpose for which they are spoken. Parables are said so to distinguish the teaching of Jesus that it may surprise

* The mere statistics are here most significant. In Matthew there are in all fifty-four references to "the kingdom," but only three occur before the so-called "Sermon on the Mount," nine in the report of that "Sermon." Of the twenty references in Mark two occur in chapter i., eighteen occur after iii. 24. In Luke "kingdom" occurs forty-two times; three of these in chapters i.–iv., but two of these have no reference to the "kingdom of God." The term "kingdom" occurs but once in Luke's version of "the Sermon" (vi. 20); and not till viii. 1 is Jesus introduced as preaching "the gospel of the kingdom." The phrase has a diacritical value. Thus in Matthew it is mainly, though, as vi. 33; xxi. 31, 43 are sufficient to prove, not exclusively "the kingdom of heaven," but in Mark and Luke it is more usual to write "the kingdom of God."

† In Matthew the "Son of Man" does not occur till viii. 20; in Mark ii. 10 and in Luke v. 24. The two last are identical and alike official, the usage is everywhere solemn. The name appears only in connexions which are serious.

‡ cf. Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27.

some that they occur in a certain definite period; are addressed, mainly, to the apostles; and are used to illustrate the social action and influence of Christianity. Thus the parables to which "the kingdom of heaven" is likened,

of the tares,
of the mustard seed,
of the leaven,
of the hidden treasure,
of the goodly pearls which the merchantman seeks,
of the net cast into the sea,*

are said to be spoken unto the disciples who pressed upon him with the request, "declare unto us the parable." A like purpose belongs to the parables peculiar to Luke, like those of the lost sheep, of the lost coin, of the two fallen sons;†

(ii) for the fact that the disillusioned spirit of Christ grows more didactic: He strikes a graver note; He forsakes the story which had borrowed from the works, in order to illustrate the ways of God; He thinks less of the seen, more of the invisible; and becomes so changed that we find Him on the Mount of Transfiguration willing to converse with Moses and Elias, or other messenger from the unseen;‡

* In Matt. xiii. 24–58. In the third verse of this chapter occurs the first reference we find in Matthew to the Greek παραβολή; thereafter it occurs in this one chapter eleven times, or twelve in all. In Mark it appears first in iii. 23, where the allusion is to "Satan casting out Satan"; but in the chapter which follows it occurs eight times. In Luke the Greek term occurs in iv. 23, where it is, quite correctly, translated in our Authorized Version as "proverb"; in v. 36 it is also found, and later with growing frequency.

† Luke xv. See also the parables which explain the idea of religion as realized in man: "The Good Samaritan" (x. 25–37); "The Pharisee and the Publican" (xxiv. 9–14); "Lazarus and the Rich Man" (19-31).

‡ cf. Matt. xvii. 3; Mark ix. 4; Luke ix. 30.

(iii) for the new note which in His teaching is most obvious when He speaks about the mode and purpose of His death: He feels the need of speech the more, that the men He addresses are those He has educated, who ought to know better than to ask what they do.*

But our purpose is less to discuss the material elements and formal features in the teaching of Jesus in His middle period than to ask the meaning, especially as concerns the education of the apostles, of the incidents described in Matthew sixteenth, or concerning

Christ's Idea of the Church.

I

1. The incidents described in this chapter show that while the public ministry of Jesus had about ended, His education of the apostles was about to begin. The ministry had resulted in the apostasy of the Israel who lived, as they judged, "according to the flesh"; but the education which concerned His own people, was to fulfil His promise and transform the fishermen of Galilee into "fishers of men," to make the disciples of Jesus into the apostles of the Christ. The men who consciously prided themselves on being God's peculiar people had not received Him;† all He could and all He did claim as His own were the simple and illiterate men with whom He then stood face to face. And the men had all the incapabilities of the unlearned; they were unimaginative, stolid, inappreciative of the ideal, unsympathetic towards suffering and every form of higher service, and had by a thousand signs shown themselves little fitted to enter into His mind, or to share

* Cf. Mark x. 35–45; and Matt. xx. 20–28. † John i. 11.

His passion, to dream His dreams, to become witnesses to His truth and preachers of His name. If ever doubt and despair, the feeling of failure, of dissatisfaction with Providence, and the belief in overmastering circumstances were justified, it was in His case. We can indeed fancy Jesus as saying, "I am fated to fail"; and surrendering His mission with a sigh. But He had the sublime unconsciousness of failure, which ever comes of the incapacity for suffering defeat; and so He speaks to His unlearned and undistinguished companions as if they were kings of men and princes of time, men who could see with His eyes and could with their own hands build the city of God. Hence He inquires of them — as if He trusted not only the hearing of their ears, but the judging of their minds, "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" And they vaguely answered, "John the Baptist, Elias, Jeremias, or some one of the prophets."* "But whom say ye that I am?" And Peter, ever swift and emphatic in speech, replies as if he spoke not for himself alone, but for his fellows as well: "Thou art" — not Jesus of Nazareth,† not a teacher sent from God,‡ not the son of Joseph and Mary,§ but "the Christ, the Son of the living God."

2. The words seemed to wake in Jesus a double vision. (i) He saw epitomized in the men before Him the ideal He had come to realize, the city of God He had begun to found, and the material He was going to build it of. (ii) But behind the men He saw the city, Jerusalem, sitting

* Cf. John i. 19–21; Matt. xvii. 10–12; Mark ix. 11–13; Luke ix. 18, 19.

† Cf. John i. 45; Matt. ii. 23; Mark i. 9; Luke iv. 16; Acts ii. 22 x. 38.

‡ Cf. John iii. 2.

§ Luke ii. 16, 33, 48; iii. 23; iv. 22; Matt. i. 16; John i. 45; vi. 42.

visibly and proudly amid her hills, with the temple in her midst, where her chief sons sat darkly plotting His death. And the city had risen to be capital of the Jewish race because the temple of God stood there, not because the palace of the king who governed had been there planted. The double vision created a double feeling in the heart of Jesus, such as may have reigned in the breast of the Almighty when, on the morning of the creation, with eternal beatitude within and the infinite possibilities of time before, He said, "Let light arise out of the darkness, and let darkness become the shadow of the light." For what the Creator then saw was, as it were, in allegory, good and evil as the coincidents of creation struggling for victory in the very hour and article of their birth. But good and evil were seen as they seem to eternity rather than as they appear to time. God saw them just as we see the passing shadow cast on the hillside by the cloud, which could neither be nor cast a shadow were it not for the light that burns above it eternal in the heavens. The shadow may pass and perish, while the hills abide in purple glory and everlasting strength. So the double vision came to the Saviour's mind, first, of the church He had begun to build by means of these human souls and out of them; and, secondly, of the human sin which was to erect His cross and cause His passion. But the double vision did not disturb the serene eye that saw it. Disasters dismay man, for they overwhelm him; but the Eternal, whom they cannot overwhelm, they neither disturb nor dismay. And Jesus, as became One who, while He lived in time, yet dwelt in eternity, was pitiful to the men who were to cause Him to suffer, and tender to the men who were to share His sufferings; but He knew that for Himself He needed neither pity nor tenderness. And so He could in the very face of disaster

and death speak of founding a church, or building a city, which the gaping gates of hell should never devour.

3. The vision of Jesus, then, may be described as a prophecy. While it follows a disciple's confession, it yet expresses the dream of the Master's imagination, and the purpose of His creative will. The confession, though invited, was yet spontaneous, not a formula He had taught or they had learned, but a deduction of their own minds, a lesson drawn from their own experience by their own thought. He had never said, "I am the Christ," nor had He instructed Peter to repeat as if the saying were a clause from a creed, "Thou art the Son of the living God." All He did was to live with them till their eyes were opened, and they saw what He was; till their ears, so to speak, heard the unuttered; their minds conceived the unspoken; and their thoughts drew the conclusions without which the Christian church could not have been, and with which it could not but become. For Jesus to hear the confession was to see the result; and His joy broke straightway into speech: "Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonah. Simple fisherman of Galilee thou mayst seem; but thou art not what thou seemest. A leader of men because a pillar of My church thou shalt be. For thou holdest high fellowship with God." "Flesh and blood hath not revealed" this truth "to thee, but My Father who is in heaven."

II

The truth was twofold: (*α*) that Jesus was "the Christ,"* and (*β*) that He was "the Son of the living God." For quick upon the utterance of this confession came the re-

* John i. 41.

markable endorsement: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."

1. What does "Thou art Peter" mean? This stands in direct antithesis to the phrase in the confession, "Thou art the Christ."* As is "the Christ" in the one passage, so is the "Peter" in the other. The name is in both cases not personal, but official; does not denote the man, but the office he fills and the character he bears. It is like a symbol expressing the quality he stands for and the function he fulfils. Peter, πέτρος, was the Greek translation of the Aramaic name Kepha, from the Hebrew Keph, Græcized as κηφᾶς, and interpreted as signifying "a stone."† The almost invariable custom of Jesus, which makes His use of Peter in the text the more solemn and significant, is to address the apostle as Simon;‡ but the evangelists often indeed used both names,§ though their almost uniform habit is to speak of him as "Peter."|| Later usage here overcomes the historical sense. Paul commonly prefers the Aramaic "Cephas,"¶ employing very occasionally "Peter."** The name Christ, which is an almost exact parallel, is almost invariably official in the Gospels and personal in the Epistles, and to this change no one has contributed more than Paul.

* Matt. xvi. 16. Wellhausen, *in loc.*, explains the use of both terms, in Aramaic as well as in Greek, as due to the need of changing the gender, which seems no explanation at all.

† John i. 42, where what is so rendered is simply the Greek πέτρος.

‡ Matt. xvi. 17; xvii. 25; Mark xiv. 37; Luke xxii. 31; John xxi. 15–17.

§ Matt. iv. 18; x. 2; xvi. 16; Mark iii. 16; xiv. 37; Luke v. 8; vi. 14; John i. 41; vi. 8, 68; xiii. 6, 9, 24, 26.

|| Matt. xiv. 28, 29; xvi. 22, 23; Mark viii. 29, 32, 33; Luke ix. 20, 28, 32, 33.

¶ 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 22; ix. 5; xv. 5; Gal. ii. 9. ** Gal. ii. 7, 8.

2. Now Jesus, who had hitherto used his proper personal name Simon, suddenly drops it for his more descriptive appellation, and says "Peter"; and continues, changing the gender that He may the better express the idea, "On this *petra*" — i.e. on this rock — "will I build My church." What did He mean?* As the term Christian stands related to the name Christ, so the title Peter stands related to this *Petra*. The great Rock, the *Petra*, unquarried, unbroken, eternal, is Christ Himself. The stone hewn from it is *petros*, the man Peter, so named because like in quality and in character to the Rock whence he was hewn. And the two words, by their felicitous conjunction, express this idea, that foundation and superstructure are all of one piece. The superstructure springs from the solid Rock, rises from it four-square, massive, immovable, the building growing out of the foundation, with all its parts so welded and bound together as to face without fear every wind that may blow, and defy every storm that may rage.

The meaning here placed upon the figure is Peter's own; of all the apostles he is the one who most loves the analogy of the rock and the stone. In one of his earliest discourses he speaks of the stone which was "set at nought of you builders," but which God had made "the head stone of the corner."† In the First Epistle which bears his name, he speaks of the Lord as "a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious"; while Christians are "living stones," "built into a spiritual house."‡ The οἶκος πνευματικός of Peter is but the ἐκκλησία of Christ;§

* Wellhausen says that Simon rightly bears the surname πέτρος for "the church" (die Gemeinde = the Christian people) "is not founded by Jesus, but through the resurrection, and Peter has the merit of having first seen the risen Lord."

† Acts iv. 11. ‡ 1 Peter ii. 4–8.

§ The term ἐκκλησία does not once occur in either 1 or 2 Peter.

and where Jesus speaks of *Petra* and *Petros*, Peter speaks of "the chief stone of the corner" and "the living stones" built around and upon it. They mean, then, the same thing; the stone and the rock are one in nature, in kind and in quality. What is taken forth from the great encompassing bosom of the eternal Rock is a living stone, and therefore is fitted to find a place in the superstructure.

3. Peter, then, stands here as a symbol, a type, and signifies the sort of man Jesus was to build His church of; but when he heard he little knew what was meant by the Rock and the Stone, by the Builder and the building. He had to live many years, and learn much by suffering much, before he could even conceive what the terms signified. But one thing we may venture to say, he never could have imagined that his name was to be one of the longest lived and most potent in history; that he was to be the leading figure in one of our most permanent controversies; that his place amid the apostles and his relation to his Master were to be much-debated questions; that an august and ancient Society was to claim him as its founder and head; and that our verse was to be construed as a personal promise that he should be its supreme Bishop, the one genuine representative in the religion of Christ. From Rome he was to govern the church. The brawny and breezy fisherman, Milton's "Pilot of the Galilean Lake," who could not speak Latin, who had never heard of the great names in its literature, whether Cicero or Lucretius, Virgil or Horace, who knew nothing of the empire and the emperor save what a vagrant soldier or an itinerant sailor may have told him, was to be the first of a dynasty which should displace the Cæsars and enthrone the Popes. There is no romance in history equal to it; no miracle that is its fellow. For all his functions and prerogatives were conveyed to

them as his successors in the see; and they as heirs to his chair were also to inherit the promise made to him, and, like him, to become vicars of Christ, endowed with such an infallibility or incapacity to err in matters of faith as secures the continued life of Christian truth in the world.

4. But suppose — though I grant the supposition is violent — Peter could have been made to understand this idea and the arguments for it, what would he have said? Probably something like this: —

"I never heard the Master utter any such promise. My memory is indeed rich in His reproofs, for I was a foolish man, forward in speech and unripe in judgment; and well do I remember the answer He gave when we asked Him, 'Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?'* Indeed, I can never see a little child without hearing His voice, recalling His words, and seeing the look that then came into His eyes. Nor can I forget the lesson He gave my presumption when I requested to be allowed to walk with Him on the water and He bade me 'come,'† or my bearing when I obeyed with reluctance; only to discover how His words were justified by the result, and I could only clasp His knees and cry, 'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.'‡ Or His reply to my daring question, 'How often shall I forgive an offending brother?'§ or the pride which went before an early and utter fall, with which I heard but did not believe His warning that Satan desired to sift me as wheat.|| But I was not the only culprit in our little band. I remember what He said when a mother requested that her sons might be allowed to sit the one on His right hand and the other on His left in His kingdom; how His ideal was not the

* Matt. xviii. 1–6. † *Ibid.*, xiv. 28–30. ‡ Luke v. 3–8.
§ Matt. xviii. 21, 22. || Luke xxii. 31–4.

exercise of authority, but rather a ministry of service and of sacrifice.* You speak of me as forward, impulsive, unstable, irritable, and easily provoked; and I was all that you say in a degree beyond what you can conceive, and in a manner that would have made it madness to invest me with qualities that better become a god than a man. And were you to force me into preëminence by means of this text, it would only be to force me to suffer degradation from a verse which immediately follows it. For the memory of His gracious words begot such pride and insolence in my heart that I hastened to advise Him in a matter so high and to me so inscrutable as His passion. And so when He began to show unto us how that at Jerusalem He must suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, I cried out, 'God forbid; this shall never happen unto Thee.' But He, with ineffable pity, yet in stern reproof, replied: 'Get thee behind Me, Satan, for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men.'† In me, as in all men, the devil lived near the saint, and profanity followed hard on the heels of piety; but surely the man He could address now as Peter — the rock or living stone of which His church was to be built — and now as Satan, and in each case with equal justice, He would never nominate to be the visible head of His church."

He does not say, upon the man named Peter, but upon the rock whence he was hewn, He should build the church He founded, though He does say, that of such men His church was to be composed. Then what He withheld was even more remarkable than what He gave. His speech concerned a man who impersonated a given character, but men who had opposite characters it did not concern. He made no promise as to Peter's successors; He never

* Matt. xx. 20–4; cf. Mark x. 35–40. † Matt. xvi. 21–3.

said that Peter should have any successors; least of all did He say that they were to be so mixed a multitude as the Bishops of Rome. We may, then, think of Peter as continuing and ending His speech thus: —

"Indeed I never remember Him speaking either of Rome or of Bishops or any succession, nor did He ever say that any person could succeed to any office He had created, nor that any office He created could invest its occupant with infallibility or any form of incapacity to err. He was ever the Saviour whose care was for man, and when He spoke of His church He thought of no place, no time, no order, and no officials; but only of what He Himself was to build and the quality of the men He was to use in the building."

In the verse, then, Peter is simply the typical Christian, but Christ Himself is the *Petra*, He out of whom the living stones are hewn, the immovable bed-rock upon which they are built; and these two — the *Petros* and the *Petra* — are one and therefore homogeneous, the foundation and the superstructure forming in material and design a unity which rises with marvellous beauty the one from the other as by the act and according to the architecture of God.

III

1. We dismiss Peter, then, and turn to our main theme: Christ's idea of the church. And here difficulties of another and even graver order meet us. (i) We have to conceive, and, if possible, explain, the singular and remarkable fact that this is the only reference which Christ ever makes to His church universal.* And this fact is all the more singu-

* In the only other instance in which the term we render "church" is placed by the Gospels, as we have them in Greek and not in Aramaic, in the mouth of Jesus, it is used to denote a community or a particular congregation. Matt. xviii. 17.

lar when we consider the extraordinary place the idea has filled in the thought of His people, and the way in which it has been for centuries an occasion for battles both of mind and blood. And what is still more strange than the want of any parallel verse by which the passage may be interpreted, is that the idea is introduced not as new, or important, or emphatic, but as old and apparently familiar. This seems to be indicated in the solitary occurrence of the name: ἐκκλησία is in no way defined or accentuated, but simply introduced like the idea of "the kingdom of heaven." (ii) It is not surprising, therefore, that scholars have raised many questions concerning the meaning and the use of ἐκκλησία. The dissonant voices of men refuse, rightly indeed, to be stilled even in the audience-chamber of the Holiest; and differences as honest and honourable ought not to separate men or keep them silent even in the presence of God. His presence is not, therefore, the place where differences ought to be suppressed. The mood of everlasting calm is sacred and becomes man only where no difference is; there nothing should be allowed to break in and mar it. (iii) It is a small compliment to say, men differ about the church on the surface, while they are at heart agreed. The agreement is apparent and the differences are real; every question of church is at bottom a question of applied religion, of Christianity as realized in society and the State, or in man and history. (iv) The difficulties which beget our differences spring from a fact, simple, fundamental, incontestable: the Gospels are not written in the language which Jesus was accustomed to speak. The Gospels are written in Greek, while He was accustomed to speak in Aramaic, and He did more than speak, He taught in it also. What we have, therefore, is a translation, thought expressed in a tongue foreign to the

Master, with associations that may be ours, but were not His.

2. Now, the point where those difficulties become most cardinal and most acute is in a term like that which here concerns us, which is, as it were, four times removed from the original. "Church" is a translation of a translation of a translation;* and translations have a trick of moving, as by arithmetical progression, away from the fontal sense. The deduction is inevitable — the term must be explained by the Epistles, not its use in the Epistles by the gospels. The point is worth making, were it only because some scholars who know the facts argue as if the facts either were not, or were different from what they are. We cannot have it both ways: either Jesus taught in Greek and not in Aramaic, or He taught in Aramaic and not in Greek. If the first alternative be adopted, we have still to explain why the last books to be written should be judged by many and dealt with by all as if they had been the first to exist; if the second alternative be accepted, then we have also to explain why a translation should have more meaning and merit and fontal truth than the original. The Greek term ἐκκλησία, which here translates the Aramaic word Jesus had used, was neither a coinage nor an invention of the evangelist; but it had even before he used it an ancient and honourable history and a fixed meaning alike in Hellenistic and in classical Greek. In its classical sense it denoted

* "Church" is a translation of κυριακόν, the representative in late Greek of ἐκκλησία, but not its equivalent or synonym. For ἐκκλησία belonged to classical Greek, and to a time when men were valued as men and not simply by their dignity as officials; κυριακόν had an opposite sense, and magnified the "day" or "place" as sacred to the "Lord," the master who possessed men. The terms were therefore different, though ἐκκλησία alone was the translation of the Aramaic original. κυριακόν appears in our version as an adjective. 1 Cor. xi. 20; Rev. i. 10.

the assembly of the free or enfranchized citizens who met to transact the affairs and to frame or administer the laws of the city. To sit in the ἐκκλησία was the birthright of every free-born Greek, who held it to be as well the guardian of his freedom and his privileges as the means by which he could in the sphere of public or political life realize his ideals. Its Hellenistic meaning was fixed by the makers of the Septuagint, who used it to translate the Hebrew *Kahal*, the congregation or assembly of collective Israel, i.e. the people — not as represented by the priesthood or the clergy, nor as congregated under these in the temple — but as gathered together in their common or corporate being as the elect of God, a nation whose civil affairs were all religious, and whose religious functions were the concern of all.

3. The term had been, then, in its Christian sense used by apostolical writers almost a generation before this gospel existed in its present form, and from them as men who thought in Hebrew, while they spoke or wrote in Greek, it received an interpretation which instructively blended the classical and Hellenistic meanings.* The

* The custom of scholars used to be to explain the prevalence and meaning of the term ἐκκλησία through the LXX., and therefore through Hellenistic Greek. Then it became customary to conceive it through the Hellenic and classic sense; now it is common to combine both methods and explain its meaning through Greek and its prevalence through the LXX. (i.) As to its meaning we have two facts to guide us, both of which have special value as to the early history and the signification of the term. (α) The man who introduces it and who freely employs it, is the one man among the apostles who can be said to be qualified alike by birth and breeding to use the term with intelligence. We know on the best authority that Paul alone among the apostles was born outside Palestine and in a city predominantly Greek yet ruled by Rome, where his father as well as himself were Roman citizens (Acts xvi. 37–38; xxii. 25–28). There is no battle which he fought more stoutly; therefore no victory he gained more complete than the victory which is represented by his making Greek the language of the new religion. His victory is here

fundamental signification was, stated in the classical sense, a society of the free and the fully privileged, or, stated in Hebrew terms, a people chosen or called of God, His elect; but while this fundamental emphasis on the people remained, it had a threefold extension or application: (i) a local or special, where it denoted a single society or assembly of redeemed men, the church of a given city, like Antioch,* or Corinth,† or Jerusalem,‡ or Ephesus,§ or the churches

so thorough that only by the use of the historical imagination can the Aramaic birth and Semitic origin of the new religion be reconstituted. (β) The fact, insufficiently recognized and appreciated, that the only writer in the New Testament who can be justly accused of having written a double history—a history which concerns equally Jesus and His apostles—is also its one writer who is a born Greek, and tells us that he has used and faithfully followed his notes (Luke i. 1–4). He is, besides, the only writer in the New Testament who uses ἐκκλησία in the strict classical sense (Acts xix. 39, 41) He has, too, sympathy and affinity with Paul. And yet while he, a born Greek, never puts the word ἐκκλησία into the mouth of Jesus, or any of His circle, he rarely allows an apostle to appear in his later History without causing him to use the term. As a simple matter of fact while the Gospel according to Luke has no single reference to the church, either in the words of Jesus or in other words spoken by those ranged alongside Him, without the Acts of the Apostles the term would be without any history in the New Testament. The book has in all twenty-three references to the church. These include the epoch-making reference in Chapter xx. to the church of God. And Luke is true to historical truth in so doing, though not to historical truth alone, for the very reason that commended "kingdom" to the Jew, viz. the way it emphasized the superiority of the one to the many, made the term offensive to the Greek; and the reason that commended ἐκκλησία to the Greek, the emphasis it threw upon the dignity of man as man, made it abhorrent to the Jew. (ii.) While its prevalence in the LXX. explains its prevalence in communities so largely composed of Jews with their ancestral passion for tradition as were the early Christian churches; yet it cannot be put down to this cause alone. There were special reasons for its prevalence in the Greek and Gentile mind which stood opposed to the Jewish, especially in the terms the Jews most liked as rooted in the Hebrew scriptures and the customs they consecrated. Hence Acts is excellent as showing how the Greek clung to terms like ἐκκλησία, were it only because they denoted ideas offensive to the Jew but agreeable to the Gentile. And in Hebrews, which is more than either the first or the most eloquent treatise in Christian theology, there are only two references to the ἐκκλησία, ii. 12, xii. 23. In the former case the term is used as in the LXX.

* Acts xi. 26; xiii. 1; xv. 3. † xi. 22.
‡ 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1. § Acts xx. 17; Rev. ii. 1.

within a given region, like Syria and Cilicia,* Galatia,† or Asia.‡ (ii) A collective or general notion, the multitude of saints who live anywhere or at any time, whether viewed as the unity which makes known to principalities and powers in heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God; § or as the community of Christians, the multitude of saints,|| or as the church of God in distinction from the synagogues of the Jews.¶ (iii) A universal sense, the redeemed of every age and race, the church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood, the body whose head is Christ and whose several members are His saints, whether these saints live in the visible or invisible world.**

4. The term with all these rich and ancient associations, whether Semitic or Gentile, Hebrew or Hellenic, formed, as it were, to the hand, the evangelist used to translate the idea and express the mind of Christ. Wellhausen says,†† "the Aramaic original k'nischta denoted the Jewish as well as the Christian community. The Palestinian Christians have retained it, never distinguishing the church from the synagogue; 'edta' is not Palestinian, but Syrian. The Syrians give 'edta' for the Christian, and 'k'nuschta' for the Jews." The distinction is neither old nor obvious; yet we cannot clearly enough either conceive or insist on the fact that the Greek word used was not Christ's, though it may have expressed a specific Christian idea.

* Acts xv. 41. † Gal. i. 2.

‡ Rev. i. 4. This sense may best be expressed by the modern "congregation," the "commonalty," the "community," or any term that throws emphasis on the men who constitute an immortal society. 1 Cor. xi. 18; xiv. 4; Matt. xviii. 17.

§ Eph. iii. 10. || 1 Cor. xiv. 33; Rom. xvi. 4.

¶ 1 Cor. i. 2; x. 32; xi. 22; xv. 9; Gal. i. 13.

** Acts xx. 28; Col. i. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. i. 22; iii. 21; iv. 23–25; 22–29, 32.

†† In his Das Evangelium Matthæi, *in loc.*

The idea, though not the term, of the church starts with Him, and His mind is at once fontal and prospective; and the word itself is interpretative and retrospective. What it signified can be in some small measure perceived. (i) Its emphasis fell upon the subjects which were to the Greek, free men; to the Hebrew, holy men; to the Christian, redeemed men. It was therefore men in any case that were denoted, whether emancipated from sin, constituted unto holiness, or placed under the reign and supreme authority of Christ. (ii) They were not left standing as units in isolation, but were organized into a unity, formed into an ordered society, which conditioned their freedom, defined their duties, guarded and guaranteed their rights. (iii) While Christ's was the ultimate authority or the sovereign power which ruled the mass, each ἐκκλησία, ultimate in its own province, was the curious compound of legislative, judicial, and administrative functions which the Greek knew how to combine, yet none knew better than he that the ἐκκλησία was but an expedient for realizing a freedom which was greater than any agency needed to secure it. Hence (iv) each ἐκκλησία or society was a constituted order, and existed for no other purpose than to realize a will which meant good to all, which was evolved from within, not imposed from without. It is characteristic of the evangelist Matthew that in the whole range of the Greek tongue, whether in its classical form or Hellenistic variety, no word could have been selected so free from the taint of sacerdotalism, or so significant of a sane and reasonable, yet ordered manhood grouped in a society, which yet was conceived as the ultimate authority which enabled a city or state to make and administer its own laws.

IV

1. But if the term be so eminently Greek, alike in its signification and connotation, how, then, ought it to be translated? The late Professor Hort, who here, unconsciously, imitated Luther's *Heilig christlich Volk*, proposes *My Israel* as a translation, which has most manifest advantages. It emphasizes the cardinal point, the people or the persons who constitute the material Christ builds into His church; and sees in them the power which alone can make and interpret the duties by which the society must live. But it has one invincible defect; it is too purely Hebraistic to express an idea which has Hellenic as well as Hebrew elements. Hort therefore suggested that it might perhaps have been best to leave the Greek term untranslated; and this is good, for it would have allowed the Greek associations of the free city and its free citizens to dwell in the mind together with the Hebrew associations of the holy man and the elect people governed by God. The two elements, Greek and Hebrew, had in the society the term denoted first blended and then rounded themselves into a distinct and definite idea. And there is such subtle life or force in a word as may enable it to make and shape and rule minds which know nothing of its history. This is a point which the term "person" well illustrates. The least instructed man does not confuse "person" with "individual." He may not know how or why the terms differ, but he does know that they so differ that while he may correctly speak of God as a "person," he cannot name Him an "individual," though out of the confusion of "three indi-

viduals" with "three persons," some of the gravest though silliest objections to the doctrine of the Trinity have come.

2. Now, our English word "church" as a rendering of ἐκκλησία is doubly unfortunate, for while it fails both to represent and interpret the Greek original, its historical and conventional usage carry us ever farther away from both the Hellenic and the Hebrew minds and associations. It tries indeed to represent and even transliterate a Greek word, but a word less noble and less honourable in both its classical and biblical senses than ἐκκλησία. Its biblical source is a humble adjective which was used in the New Testament to qualify or denote either the sacred day,* or the sacred supper,† as the Lord's; while in its classical and conventional use it distinguished, among other things, the palace or the hall where the business of the State was transacted as royal or imperial or simply as Cæsar's. Hence the term κυριακόν, whence the English word "church" is derived, had come by the fourth century to denote the house where the Lord's people met; and then by a familiar process of change it was applied to the people as well as the place. The Latin nations illustrate the opposite process; their names for what we call the "church," which spring from ἐκκλησία, originally emphasized the people as free and as legislative; but, having been handled without due care, it designates here the place and there the polity, now a particular congregation, and now the universal society, whether of the converted or the baptized.

3. But the ambiguity which history enables us to understand inheres like a sin of origin in all the forms our word has assumed in all the cognate tongues. In the German

* Apoc. i. 10.
† 1 Cor. xi. 20.

"kirche," in the Dutch "kerk,"* in the Scandinavian "kerke," in the Scottish "kirk," which all seem like immediate yet abbreviated echoes of the original; and in the English "church," which looks like a sound too confused by distance to be quite intelligible — we have the mixed associations of κυριακόν, now denoting the people from the place where they worship, and now substituting the place for the people.† Scholars, feeling how a term may hide a cardinal truth, have tried now to expel "church" from our version,‡ and now to fill it with some of the majesty and meaning of the word it has superseded; but they have tried in vain. Terms which denote the people and do not connote the building, like "congregation," "society," or "community," have been proposed as verbal substitutes; phrases which are more descriptive than denominative, like "body of the faithful," or "assembly of the saints," or "God's elect," have been suggested as means of getting rid of late and baneful distinctions like those between clergy and laity, or priests and common folk; but back the term has come, as if it had never been expelled, with all its old associations and confusions, or as if it had a prescriptive and indefeasible right to govern mind. By the "church" so used Christ Himself has been held responsible for our deeds. His authority has been made to depend in a strange way upon the per-

* While the general synod of the Dutch Reformed Church in 1866 retained "kerk" as the name of the national institution, in the translation of the New Testament it approved the ordinary synonym for "church," i.e. gemeente = gemeinde, Ger. = "congregation" in English. The name thus recognizes the justice of the criticism in the text and throws the emphasis on the people.

† Isaac Watts in his *Logic* gives its varied meanings thus: "The Church is a religious assembly, or the large fine building where it meets, or a synod of bishops or Presbyters, or the Pope and a general council."

‡ *V. supra*, 145 n.

versities of human error, the oddities of human devotion, and the terms in which men confess their beliefs. Earth loves to hear Heaven endorse its judgments; and nowhere has the desire of man to get God's will to confirm and sanction his choice, rather than compel his will to obey God's, been more vigorously expressed than in the way he has filled this great idea with the dreams and the presumptions of his own imagination.

V

1. But more significant than either the constituents of the church or the Peter who is their type, is the Person who is its foundation, architect, and builder, all in one. The varied forms under which His action is expressed are most impressive. (i) The Messianic idea and the Sonship which Peter has just confessed are the stable foundation upon which the church is to be built; and while the substructure stands the superstructure cannot be shaken. (ii) He is the builder: "I will build." To be the builder is also to be the architect; as the action and the energy to which the church owes its being are His, His is the design they realize; and His therefore the creative will which bids it be and become, grow and increase. (iii) What He builds He owns: "My church"; the materials used are the men He redeemed, and just as the world God made belongs to the God who made it, so He who built the church possesses the church He has built. (iv) His church will be as immortal as Himself; for since His action can never cease, its continuance will be for ever; and so against it "the gates of Hades shall not prevail." * In the midst of time it is conscious of

* Cf. Ps. ix. 13; lxii. 18. Wellhausen says, *in loc.* that "the Gates of Hell" are symbolic of "the greatest danger." This is better than the idea that "the gates" which protect the city are symbolic of law and order.

His eternity, which means its own immortal being, and so it fears neither death nor the grave. "The body of Christ" can say, "because He lives I shall live also." What was true of Him is true of it: "It is not possible that it should be holden of death."

2. On the basis of this exposition we must now attempt to build up a positive doctrine of the church. The point from which we can best start is the conclusion we have reached in the course of our historical discussions. The idea of the church once lived in the mind of Christ, and has unfolded itself in the history of His people. We may summarize the idea thus: — The constituent elements of the church are two: the Saviour who saves that He may govern, and the men who are saved in order that they may be governed. These are essential, all else is accidental — either machinery man has made, or fashions his devotion has followed, or customs time has formed, or policies, stratagems, orders, rules — copied perhaps from the pomp and circumstance of States or organized by the church itself to meet some moment of struggle and strain; but as such they belong neither to its *esse* nor to its *bene esse.* We too often forget that the essence of the sect is the accident of the church. What is necessary to the being of the one is no note of the other nor even a condition of its well-being. The essence of the church lies in the Saviour who reigns and the people He governs. Where He is, there is His church; and where He reigns, there His people are.

VI

1. We have, then, the Saviour who saves. Two things, indeed, fill me with astonishment. (i) The supreme confidence — serene, calm, as becomes One who possesses an

energy too absolute to be disturbed — of Him who said, "I will build." And (ii) the material which He was to use in the building. And these two spring from one root, and mean the same thing. The confidence is in Himself, and the material is of a kind that, while it becomes Him to use it, was such that the great empire builders would have turned from the same material with scorn. What indeed would have caused them to despair filled Jesus with hope, which proved His divine originality. For He was not the first person who had in His mind formed an ideal society. Centuries before Him Buddha had lived in India, where he had dreamed of a state of elect men, separated from the world, shut up to celibacy, made to live as those who held beatitude to be loss of conscious and active being. His dream was marred as it was marked by two things: (i) It was ascetic and antisocial, and by inexorable consequence its victory was the death of progress. For it made a complete separation of the initiated disciple from the world and the duties that most ameliorate its hard and painful lot. And (ii) it was an estimate of life that was the child of despair — hatred of being rather than a love of men. There is an infinite difference between pity for human suffering and love for human souls. Never has the pity for human suffering been more nobly expressed than in Buddha; but only in Christ have we the consuming, passionate, saving love of souls. We may so pity suffering that we hate life, for in living men must endure pain; but if we love souls, then we hate sin, we hate sorrow, we hate whatever adds to the element of life the ingredient of pain. In Christ we have love of man direct, immediate, face to face, and this makes the material he employs in the building of his church. He is thus penetrated and possessed by the passion to save.

As many centuries before Christ as Buddha, Confucius

had lived in China, and had said — even as later Western men said — that the proper way to govern a state was for sages to be the counsellors of kings and for kings to be the pupils of the sages, forgetting the fact which is stranger than fiction, that the sagest man in the theory of the state may be the unwisest man in statecraft. And centuries also before Christ Greece was wealthy in thinkers who laboured to construct the ideal of a perfect state, though they loved their own Greek cities too well to imagine that a better polity than they suggested or embodied was either possible to men or actual among them. Plato's *Republic* and his *Laws*, the dreams, respectively, of his manhood and of his less hopeful age, embodied the theory of the Greek city. In the ideal of his splendid manhood the king was to be a philosopher, and the philosopher a king, which was but the Confucian doctrine stated in a Greek form. He forgot how disputatious philosophers could be; how prone they were to accentuate differences and to argue till harmony became disagreement. And the disagreements of philosophers are not royal qualities or of a kind victory can decide. Men were to be educated till their unstable humanity was got out of them. Religion or mythology was to be manipulated till it ceased to create fear and made the least healthful appeal to the imagination. Property was to be common. Families were to be abolished, and the home was to become an affair of the state. Wives were to be common, and the children were to belong to the community rather than to their own parents. All this Plato dreamed, and much more than this; but it happily remains a dream, studied by the educated as an ideal destined never to become a reality, and certain, were it ever realized, to make a world worse than the actual. In his less hopeful age Plato thought much of the abstract, and imag-

ined it was more potent than the concrete; speculated more concerning the laws that govern man and less concerning the man they govern. And after him came many a dreamer, like Dante, who thought of a monarchy where justice was to reign and the king, though able to do wrong, was so to do right as to secure the freedom of each and the equality of all; or like Thomas More, who conceived his Utopia as a state without local habitation or any name, which no hands had built and where mortal men might worship God uncoerced and unafraid; or like Bacon, who imagined his Atlantis as an island in the great ocean where men lived according to laws which embodied a divine ideal; or like Harington and Milton and Algernon Sidney, who all built commonwealths of the mind, free states where man could think his noblest and become his best. But these men were one and all dreamers; they made literature, but not men; they taught us to imagine a happier state and showed us the conditions which, by making a better society possible, might make a higher humanity actual. We are grateful to these dreamers for their dreams, but they only serve to measure the immense distance between the good which genius may conceive and the good which God alone can produce or achieve. And it has need to be good of God's production; man is so poor as material to be built into a stable society.

2. Jesus, then, was no dreamer of literary ideals, which men in later ages could amuse and educate themselves by discussing. He was a veritable Creator, or one who willed to create and the creation happened, who designed to save man and man was saved. He said: "Know Me, and through Me know the Father"; and men, when they knew as He bade them, rose up changed men. The heavens above them ceased to be vacant, and from out the stars

there looked down the myriad eyes of a God who said: "I am the Father of all men; and since all men are My sons, all must be brothers."

And what have the results been? We may say noble, magnificent, such as no one could have imagined. Man ceased to be thrown in the amphitheatre to the wild beasts or to be an article of commerce to men; women ceased to be an object of lust; humanity became a unity, stood up and marched as to a divine music, all its units being penetrated by the divine mind in order to the fulfilment of the divine purpose.

3. Let us think, not in classes or types, nor, as the saying is, "in continents," which may be a mode of thought both poor and mean; but in terms of man, though as massed in continents, accumulated in nations. In Europe more than two hundred millions of men live who have the same faith as ourselves, though disguised in varied forms and under many names. In America, in our colonies, and at home one hundred and forty millions of men use our tongue. And what constitutes the very heart and spirit of all these peoples? Can we doubt that it is Christ and His message? Take as a type out of the great multitude our own London — the immensest, most populous, richest, poorest, the most ubiquitous city in the world; her energies run to the uttermost parts of the earth; her eyes are everywhere. Where wealth is to be found, there some of her myriad hands are groping; where money is wanted, there some one or several of her myriad money-lenders are prepared to offer it for loan or sale; wherever man is, there she is, and she ever seeks to draw men to herself from all parts of the globe, to enlarge, to enrich, and to impoverish. What now stands in our great London for all that is ameliorating, progressive, orderly,

potent in good? Let any stranger come up her ancient river, and see how high, overtopping all other towers and palaces, rises the lofty dome of St. Paul's. He asks: "Is it under this dome that your men coin their money? Is it from that lordly peak they look for markets throughout the world?" And the answer is: "Nay! There amidst all their warehouses, reigning over all their daily interests, stands the symbol of their faith!" Higher up the river lie the ashes of our most illustrious dead, shadowed by the Cross and consecrated by the name of the Crucified. Why do the ashes lie there but to express the faith of our people as the most sacred thing our people has? They enshrine the names they love in the faith they hold. Pass through the streets, and mark how, in places where they are needed, huge hospitals rise. There are nurses in the crowded ward where lie the suffering and the sick, moving with a soft foot, and speaking with the gentle voice, so excellent a thing in woman, to heal and to help the suffering. There the knife of the surgeon has ceased from its cruel power of slaying, and turned into a beneficent minister of health and life; there the physician seeks to battle with grim disease and make the sound body for the sound mind to dwell in. Pass on, and you will see in almost every street, even the most sordid, a building consecrated to sacred use; where, close beside it, lives a man of God amid men of mankind given up to the service of men, with the message meant for their healing, with a word meant for their saving. And if our stranger were to come in the green month of May, when all nature is fragrant and the country is winsome, what would he find? Gathered in the great city hosts of men who tell of the Scriptures translated into every language men speak, and circulated in every inhabited land.

And what is the reason? Because they publish the name of Jesus and perpetuate His teaching. Men come, and there are books to be read, and social societies to print and to disperse them; there are societies to shelter the innocent, prosecute the guilty, to help the poor, to ameliorate the lot of the sad; societies designed to heal every ill flesh is heir to, to breathe health into sickness, to create purity in guilt, to surround helpless infancy with the strong hands of gracious protection. And if you ask what is the mainspring of all these, giving them purpose and power, what man dare say other than this, "They are the creation of the Jesus who preached the Gospel in Galilee, backed by the men who preach His Gospel in England to-day."

4. Have I spoken of London in terms that may seem extravagant, though they can only so seem to such as do not know her? There is, indeed, a dark side to all the brightness. Eastward and southward lives squalor — miles upon miles of squalor, and hunger and suppressed passion, and possible eruption of things terrible and chaotic. And westward, lined indeed with lanes where live the unclean and the gross, lie selfishness and pride and exclusiveness, though with many a noble strain here and there and many a high purpose within it. In the night season, and often in the day, does not sin walk the streets, deprave the youth, lay hold upon our spirits, bind us, as it were, more and more in the chains from which Christ was born to set us free? Do not think that we can do our duty afar if we forget it at home! Nor can duty be neglected without the neglect affecting the whole man. We have therefore here simply to note how greed and envy and the power of mischief have grown. We can see how a man who has his rum or his spirits to sell sells them to the lower races, which he kills by the sale! Or

how men greedy for diamonds, and with an unholy hunger for the land which conceals gold and diamonds, make short work of the native that owns the land, then some master comes who degrades him into a slave. Or how men learn to sin in our great cities, and carry their base, debauching sin amongst the simple peoples they waste and ruin. Or how our literature, subtle, sceptical, now and then irrational in its very rationality, penetrates in amongst the people we are seeking to convert and to hold, and makes them turn in scorn upon the man that preaches, as if all England thought and believed as do the men who make our letters. Yes, there is in England a conscience which insists upon the weaker race being kindly nursed, loved, and tended — a conscience which bids us say to the trader in things evil, "Pause ere you blight." Our giant's might is still restrained, and we are not allowed to use it as a giant with a giant's resistless and regardless energy. It is bound in chains; and as far as the law can restrain we restrain the might to do harm. Christian England is not free to act as acts the reckless people; she is bound by the law of the Kingdom, to establish which Christ came.

VII

1. Christ then is the cause of the quality of His religion; all the grace which the church possesses through Him she possesses that she may distribute. He, in effect, says: "Time is eternity; let eternity fill time. Thou art, O man, immortal, and in every moment of thy being be immortal man." A new dignity came to humble individuals, the lowliest is exalted, the proudest is abased; for where eternity had swallowed up time what could mortals do but feel their mean estate?

New ideals took possession of the individual and quickened the organization of the race. Humanity had breathed into it the breath of life, but the method was so simple that it seemed as if any one might have devised it, yet so radical and potent that without the energy of God the change could not have been. Yet its apparent simplicity must not be allowed to conceal the unique originality of the method. Jesus, when founding His church, took no man out of society; He left him where he stood, but He changed the man and through him the society. He withdrew no father from his family, no wife from her husband, no daughter from her mother, no citizen from the state, no artisan from his craft, no physician from his practice, or lawyer from his clients. He left them there, but, changing the men, He changed all, the circumstances through the man, not the man through the circumstances. It was a divine achievement — a new creation we may call it — but not a dream. For it is the most colossal reality of history. The church has stood and has worked for ages without knowing decrepitude or decay. It has prevailed against the gates of Hades, though they at first gaped to devour it.

2. But there are many who will say: "Ah! this idea of the church, as simply made up of Christ and His people, is far too simple to be true, too bodiless to be efficient, too impalpable to be real. A church to be actual must be organized, possessed of officers with divine rights, with an authority which can make and administer laws higher than those of any state, with severer sanctions because a sterner will to enforce. But what is the worth of sanctity apart from effectual means of enforcement? Without a legal and political framework, how can the church live and govern, guide and legislate, for a being as refractory as man?"

The church proves history to be the pathway of God; history can never prove the church to be divine. She lives above all truth of fact. But look at nature, and let us ask, What are the constituents of her order and beauty and continuance? Once men thought: — the earth a flat plain, with heaven as a roof in which the sun shone by day and where the moon and stars came out in the darkness; they fancied the sea and the rivers to be intended to keep the peoples at peace by keeping them apart, and the land to be a stable centre round which all things revolved. But what has been the struggle of modern knowledge? Has it not been to escape from this mocking idea of a universe which is limited to earth, and to discover both the range and the reality of existence or what actually is? And has it not found the ultimate constituents of all this fair and ordered cosmos in atoms, individual, distinct, indestructible, each having its own being, its own properties, its own history, its own modes of action, though all are dominated, governed, and harmonized by a supreme law? Before the imagination of the physicist there rises the vision of a universe illimitable, infinite, though without centre, a circumference made up of an infinity of separate particles, each constant in essence, invariable in quality, uniform in quantity, yet all, while mutable in form, immutable as factors of change, exercising in their collective being the inexhaustible energy which creates the furniture of earth and sky, though they are themselves the very furniture we see and hear and handle.

Now, in the church there are but two constituents: (i) the Person who can attract, control, command; (ii) the persons who can be attracted, controlled, commanded; though much may be said for a third, the medium through which the Supreme Person works and in which the subordinate persons

live. But this third element, the medium, is only a subjective necessity of thought, which is, objectively, but the form, whether we name it space or time, that permits the other two to meet and mingle, to act and react upon each other. As every atom is a centre of force, so every person is a home of myriad energies; and as atom can act on atom, so person on person, the action being ever reciprocal and transmissible. As Schelling said, the personal can alone heal the personal; and so otherwise than through man it is impossible to reach men. What does not enter humanity as human must stay for ever outside; what has no affinity with the soul, what speaks to it in an alien tongue concerning alien things, must remain a foreigner on its hearth, and a stranger to its thought. Hence God had to become man to reach men; only as a person could Christ reach persons, and out of the persons He reached He constituted His church that He might penetrate the whole race and remake mankind from within. He thus took personality that He might the better communicate the recreative energies of God; and here we have, in brief, the meaning of the incarnation, which ceases to be a mystery the moment its purpose is perceived. The men who for the time being embody God's recreative energies constitute His church, which as the vehicle of His life continuously transmits what it has received from Him.

VIII

1. It is the men composing the church who give to it the outward appearance which is seen of men; it seems as they are. Of the two forces which form the church Christ is the creative and men the created. Both,

indeed, are active, for he who exhibits must act as well as He who gives; but the creative is the fountain and source of all the derived or created activity. While the energy, then, is Christ's, the forms it assumes are as varied and multitudinous as the persons who compose His church. To try to compel His energies to flow in any single channel which man has made is, as it were, instead of leaving nature to speak in her own language, to attempt to force her to use some little local dialect of our own. It may be easier to understand our own dialect than to learn and interpret her larger speech; but our dialect is the tongue of our tribe, while her speech is the language of man. People may speak to us in the dialect of their tribe of apostolic descent or inalienable orders; but the only apostolic descent we can recognize is the vehicle which brings to us the life of Him who died. If that life has come to us through many an obscure man and many a humble woman on whom no episcopal or any sacerdotal hand was ever laid — as was this writer's case, he, at least, can never forget the part played by his own mother in bringing the life of God to his soul — how can we regard apostolic descent as the distinction or the attribute of the episcopal or the priestly race alone? Is it true that all the piety of the church has been their direct bestowment? or that they can claim to have formed all the saints, heroes, or martyrs who have for Christ's sake or His church's lived, suffered, or died? But if, as they well know, any such claim would be preposterous, what is the good of the theory? To make what is not necessary to the higher saintliness, or the purer devotion of the soul, essential to the being and the well-being of the church, is but to make reason and truth, which are of God, alike ridiculous. It is, besides, to set argument the thankless task of proving an historical accident or a

trivial circumstance, a matter of absolute validity and inherent worth.

2. And here we can appeal to history with confidence: goodness has not been the attribute of any sect or section of ecclesiastical men; the apostolic life has been realized by multitudes who have stood or been made to stand outside the so-called apostolic tradition, and who have been saintly if not sainted and canonized men. We need not go back to the apostolic age, that would make our list too long — the habit of the official "good man" to recognize no goodness which differs in type from his own is inveterate — but rather let us start lower down. We begin, then, with a man born in heathenism — where he had been taught to regard the Christian religion as ridiculous, as a folly to be laughed at — about 160, and he died a Christian about 240.* He bears the name of Tertullian.† He is an orator, jurist, divine, apologist, who formulates the doctrine of tradition, elaborates the theories of the creation and soul of man, whether he be conceived according to the East as an individual, or according to the West as our collective humanity, whether its sin be thought of as the sin of a person or a race, the

* The dates are here uncertain, curiously so, especially in the case of one so free in his communications about himself and others. Thus, in the matter of his conversion, between the 185 of Cave (i. 56) and the date of Pusey in the Oxford translation of Tertullian's opera (Introduction, i. 2), 196, there is a difference of eleven years; the date of his apostasy to Montanism, Cave fixes at 199, Pusey at 201, so that in the one case he was fourteen years, in the other but five in Catholicism (cf. *Apolog.*, c. 18).

† Jerome, *De Viris Illustr.*, c. 53. Jerome simply says that Tertullian lived to "a great age," sharing all its decrepitude. This is not the only piece of information we owe to Jerome. He tells us that Tertullian was but a Presbyter; that he was driven out of the church by the envy of the clergy; that he was a principal Latin writer; that he lived in Carthage; and that his father was either a "pro-consul or centurion." We owe him, besides, the anecdote as to Cyprian calling Tertullian his "master," and never passing a day without reading him.

sin we know as personal or as original; he builds up the notion of a canon or rule of faith, whether understood of the church or the Scriptures. He introduces philosophical jurisprudence into theology, coins more terms that become technical and influential in Western Christian thought than any other Father. He is honoured and revered, whether as Father or as theologian,* as a man who esteems equally integrity of soul and veracity of speech. Origen, in the accident of his birth, was more highly favoured than Tertullian; he was born about 185 of Christian parents. He died about 254 — far from his native Alexandria, ascetic, recluse, sage, scholar, a master thinker and the most blameless spirit of his time; gentlest of men, he was yet too unyielding to bend before persecution; learned, he was too conscientious to profess knowledge where he knew himself ignorant; an allegorist in interpretation, he yet so loved the letter that he imposed the ethics of the Gospel upon himself in their most literal sense; as a critic faithful to the religion which had trained him and to the place he had been educated in, he yet stood true to the method and to the ideas of God and the word of Pantænus and of Clement, turning what they had taught him against a Greek like Celsus; as a speculative genius he built the faith he believed in into a system.† These two men were too good to be canonized; no church has called them saints; each has left them outside its apostolic order and apostolic descent. Yet Christ, who recognizes

* See among others Renan, who speaks of Tertullian's eminence, calling him "a great writer," yet charges him with "bad taste" (*Marc-Aurèle*, p. 456).

† On the περὶ ἀρχῶν I cannot trust myself to speak. The first systematic treatise still remains the most daring, though its audacities are more those of childhood than of manhood. But the man who first broke ground here is a courageous man.

genuine merit everywhere, acted through them, and still acts through them.

About one hundred years after the death of Origen, in 353, a man was born who was destined to become a great Father of the church, a bishop and a saint, the most potent theologian of the West, whose antecedents were both Pauline and neo-Platonic, for in his most characteristic books sentences, nay, whole paragraphs, are taken bodily from Plotinus.* Augustine was a strong ecclesiastic, and much was forgiven him on this account; he was full of apologetic fervour, for had he not built the city of God and vindicated His truth against the heathen and the heretic? The twin pillars of his orthodoxy were the sovereignty of God and the depravity of man; the former he conceived as the sole causality of God in nature and in grace — the one because the other; the latter he construed through the freedom he had vindicated against the Manichean, and the bondage through sin and to it which he had vindicated against the Pelagian. The two he had connected and justified by a doctrine of conversion which made faith the gift of God, and the depraved man, if converted, the man best able to conceive and believe in the divine sovereignty. With these ideas he conjoined a notion, based on the sole causality of God, which in its native harshness and simplicity is severer than anything associated with the name of Calvin. It takes a bad man to believe in the theology of Augustine, especially where it touches human depravity. The man who stands over against Augustine is Pelagius. He believed in freedom of the human will, in the excellency of human virtue, and in the honour it has before God, and ought to have within

* The book referred to is that on which Augustine's fame as a Christian theologian mainly rests, the *Confessions*.

the church. His notions, whether of the will or virtue, whether of the church or of God, were strictly and logically monkish, and so, though a heretic, Pelagius has as good a moral right to be sainted as Augustine, for his piety is as deep, his integrity as real, his devotion as little open to question. His theology was the more monkish, Augustine's the more philosophic and pagan, with sources rather neo-Platonic and stoic than biblical. Both were men Christ would have acknowledged; though a society which claimed to be His church has canonized the one and anathematized the other as a heretic.

We follow the same method and bid the Middle Ages supply us with our next example. Dante is driven from his Florentine home, and seeks a place where he could forget the city of his birth, of his loves and his hates, and where he himself could dwell in peace. But he finds that earth has for him no second Florence, and so he calls up a vision of the world invisible to redress the terrible sins and cruel wrongs of the visible. He shows us the shames, the agonies, the dire reminiscences, and the grim punishments of his many-cycled and deep hell; then guides us up the vast and holy mount of the Purgatorio; and finally he leads by the gracious hands of the glorified Beatrix to the hill of the beatific vision whence we can see God. But we have another type of piety in Thomas à Kempis, a monk and saintly man, who in his soul broods over the divine example, forsakes and forgets the world; and thinks man's chief end is to imitate Christ, though the Christ he would have us imitate is no longer the blithesome Jesus of Galilee, but a pale and suffering and sorrow-laden mediæval monk. But who would say that Dante, the strenuous thinker and poet, doing battle for freedom, is not a saint as perfect as Thomas à Kempis?

In the period of the Reformation Luther preaches of the Babylonish captivity of the church and the bondage of man's will; while Erasmus advocates man's freedom that he may the better plead for his right to continue to make terms with error that distress may not come. But who would say that there was not as much room in the church; or that Christ had not as much need for the sensitive and delicate, the timorous and temporizing Erasmus as for the buoyant and boisterous Luther? In the same century Thomas More fears God too much to please his king, and goes to death, losing his head rather than ruin his conscience; while Thomas Cranmer, who had obeyed two sovereigns, and tried to obey a third, but failed, burns at the stake the right hand that had signed his recantation. But may we not say that Thomas Cranmer, with his burned right hand, is within the same ample fold that sheltered and enshielded Thomas More? Richard Hooker pleads for a church that is a commonwealth, and whose legitimate head was a sovereign; Thomas Cartwright pleads for a church ruled by Christ and charged with the control of its own affairs — though the two never dreamed of raising the question, What is the church, officers or people, law and institution, or men? But both meet in their common loyalty to their invisible Head. John Hales might bid John Calvin good night at Dort, but it was only to wish him good morning when they met in heaven. John Milton and John Bunyan alike dreamed of an eternal city large and free enough to hold all the sinners of mankind whom grace had saved. Richard Baxter and George Fox wrestled and contended over "steepled meeting-houses," but greater than the steepled meeting-house was the devotion they had in common to Him whom neither had seen, yet both loved. Jonathan Edwards

speculated on high themes, and John Wesley achieved great things, though each despised the theology of the other; but deeper than their reciprocal contempt for their respective theologies was their enthusiasm for their common Saviour. And so, through all time, extending through all churches, realized in every one who believes — in some more and in others less, perhaps — there lives and penetrates the great church of Christ.

IX

But how does this universal society of the holy, built out of such mixed and flawed material as we call men, stand related to the multitudinous organizations which name themselves churches? Men say, "I believe in the visible church." I believe, indeed, in visible churches; but the invisible church I believe in is like the invisible God, a secret energy, universal and unbounded. The visible Catholic Church would be like a visible infinite, and what were a visible infinite but infinity fettered with the limitations of finitude? We must conceive the divine society as free from the conditions of time and place, master in its own eternity and through that in our time; and as standing in a divine order all its own, supreme, infallible, as becomes the church of Christ.

1. We have to consider, then, the relation of the building Christ built to the material He used. This relation may be one of character, which is simple; or of polity, which is more complex. (i) The simpler, which concerns the relation of all our visible churches to Christ's holy catholic and invisible church. (ii) The polity raises the question of the relations in which the organizations that man forms and

administers stand to the great structure built of living stones formed by the will and act of Christ.

I would not undervalue historical churches or their achievements, whether for particular states, for special peoples, or for humanity as a whole, though these things ever tend to coalesce. I never feel the greatness of Christ so much as when I face these churches and think He made them, and though they may fail of His service, yet, in spite of that failure, He still loves and still condescends to use and to bless them. A church constituted by accidents and emphasizing these accidents, will not fulfil its chief function, especially if it so prides itself on these as to forget the aims and ideals of the Christ who made it and who means to rule it. I know no greater panorama than the panorama of Christian churches organized and visible. In the East, stretching from the Ægean up to the Arctic Sea, from the Baltic eastward to the Pacific, reigns the old Græco-Russian church. There it lives, proud of its patriarchal clergy, of its liturgy, written in the very tongue the apostles spoke, of its abhorrence of the "filioque," and all the institutions that came with it into the darksome west. Then at Rome there sits a church whose head is called infallible — which means his inability to confess that either he or his predecessors erred even where their errors are most manifest; it is, too, a church immense, distributed everywhere, which speaks all the tongues man uses, and, in spite of its own and its head's infallibility, though illustrated by an infinity of errors and mistakes, it still continues to live and to be believed. In Germany there is a church which loves the Fatherland, and teaches it to love the dear God, and which provides many a scholar for the investigation of things sacred and for the enlightenment of Christendom. In England there is a historical church proud of its affini-

ties with the Roman and the Greek — affinities which they are not so proud of or so prompt to recognize — distinguished for its learning, its love of its stately homes, its ornate service, its high dignitaries, and its great position in history which belongs to its position in the State. In Switzerland, in Holland, in Scotland, there is a Presbyterian church, conscious of its high ideals, its orthodox faith, and its stern sons whose heroic virtues have shone in the arena of public and social life. In all English-speaking lands there are churches similar in character and quality, in faith and conduct, though more varied in form and of a more independent spirit, facing the proud aristocracies of office and ritual in the faith of a prouder vocation in Christ Jesus. Now we dare not speak of these churches as sects, for each has felt in its own way and degree that it cannot part from man or lose its hold upon his immortal soul. But why are they and for what reason? They are, for Christ is, and the power they have lived in and exercised is power they owe to Him. The church could not have stood in Russia in the strength of only an imperial Czar, or of an abhorred "filioque," nor, indeed, could it have lived at all without a divine Consoler to speak to the humble peasant, and even where the church repressed it has taught him to exercise his faith and to feed his spirit. The Roman church could not have endured, in spite of her sacraments and her priesthood, her altars and her music, her splendid history and her spacious cathedrals, without the saints Christ made, without the martyrs she honours, without, not Mary the Virgin, but Mary's Son, who gives her all her dignity and all her grace. Nor could there ever have lived in the German Fatherland a church of science and of the spirit

had it not been for the faith that came through Luther and the Gospel he preached of Christ's free grace. And what gives the Anglican church its power, its love for its orders, and its place in society, save the desire to make articulate what it conceives to be the truth which is in Christ Jesus? And what inspires all the Presbyterian and Independent churches, however they may be named and distinguished; what creates within them a conscious unity; what fills them with a vivid jealousy for doctrine and a noble jealousy for life, and a divine passion for men, save their faith in the Christ who loved and loves men, who lives in them and seeks to bring them into a divine society? Churches fail when they emphasize their own accidents; they reign in triumph when they do His will and seek to accomplish His redemption.

2. From the Founder's relation of His church to the State and to history or to man, as well as to the names it bears, we may see the magnanimity of Christ. He consents to live in communities that call themselves or are called by such vain names as Presbyterian or Independent, Baptist or Methodist, Anglican or Lutheran, Papal or Russian churches, and with still greater humility He consents to dwell in proud communities which claim to be either imperial, infallible, or apostolic. If there be laughter in Deity, must it not be at the follies of the men who think that they hold God in their custody and can distribute Him to whomsoever they will? The last apostasy on our part is to be insolent to the humblest member of Christ's body; the highest and most condescending grace on His side is His consenting to abide in communities so lordly as to hold themselves aloof from the common duties of brotherhood. He reigns in and tolerates their very errors for the sake of the loving works they do. And yet how

sad it must be when He who loves to see of the travail of His soul is forced to look upon the perfervid profanity of men who dared to put their time into His eternity; to bind immensity to the small spot in space which they occupy; and to tie the holy and divine infinitude of grace to some doctrines of paltry and mortal man!

X

1. We return, then, to the position: — Christ as supreme is the absolute Sovereign of His own church. He reigns and governs; beside Him there is no second. Now here emerges one of those extraordinary features that makes His position and His action altogether singular, and shows Him in His simple sublimity. If we ask any jurist or student of political philosophy, What is the ultimate basis of authority in the State? he will tell us, "It is the power of life and death. Unless the chief of the State could at the demand of public justice cut off a man's head, it could not be the guardian of right. Not in vain therefore does the magistrate bear the sword." Alexander becomes a world's king because he has been a world's conqueror. The might of Cæsar was in his legions. Napoleon may have ruled the army which he led to victory, by its love now of glory and now of plunder; but it was the army that made him ruler of France and the master of Continental Europe. And what are our modern republics save "demos" on the throne, with a will that must be obeyed, whoever may resist? For how did a man like Mohammed found his religious state? He founded it, said Kremer, by forming a federation of Arab tribes for the robbery and plunder of the world. He conquered in the might of a force based on the lust of wealth. Now here is

a fact that must be reckoned with, for it is in singular opposition to all experience — the supremest and most enduring authority in time is an authority without physical force; the authority is the Christ who bears no sword. He has no army. No multitudes of armed men march behind him with banners unfurled and with crosses on their breasts. Where men have unsheathed the sword in His name they may have left behind a solitude, and miscalled peace; but the solitude has turned out a fruitful garden, only the seed sown in it has been dragon's teeth which have sprung up as warlike and ravening men. But Christ Himself has no sword; he leads no bannered army; He has no marshalled host behind Him, whom He has summoned into the battle-field; He lives to faith; He reigns in conscience; and there through centuries, when the Emperor was no Christian, either as man or as emperor, through centuries when he may have become a Christian man without becoming a Christian emperor — for our religion has suffered more from imperial protection than from imperial persecution — Christ has lived and reigned, the one Person in all time whose authority is absolute, yet without resting on physical force. He holds men as the great law of gravitation holds the material universe, and they circle round Him, like the planets in their places, or like a sun in its sphere, where all is harmony because created by His almighty love.

2. As the church He rules is His creation, it ought to be as He is. As Christ is the incarnation of God, the church ought to be the incarnation of Christ. Every phrase used of Him as the eternal Son of the Father ought to be capable of application to the church as His incorporated spirit. If the matter be so understood, then the church ought to be the brightness of His glory, and the express

image of His person, ought to seek to accomplish the things He most desires, to beseech man with His many-toned voice to be reconciled to God; and to act as His million-fold hands to build up an ideal society among men. Now the church ought to incarnate Christ in two main respects: as regards functions, and as regards acts.

XI

The functions, which are three, were known of old as those of priest, prophet, and king.

A

1. The priesthood belongs to the collective society, to the men who have been taken into the fellowship of His death. To argue that it may be delegated to an official class is to show a distressing lack of insight into the heart of the truth. A function which belongs to a body as a common and collective whole may be distributed under two forms, either (α) by every member, simply by virtue of his belonging to the body corporate, having the power or the right to exercise its special and peculiar functions; or (β) by a deliberate and collective vote the society may authorize certain persons to act in its name, and to fulfil vicariously its functions. The first form is too essential to membership and inseparable from it to be conceived or represented as delegation to any order or class of officers; what belongs of right and not simply of choice to the body neither the body as a whole nor any of its parts can surrender, just as a living man cannot surrender life and still remain alive. The second form is even more impossible of fulfilment; for the society as a whole has never met and never voted, and so has never attempted to carry through any such delegation of

function as is here implied. Nor could it even if it had so willed. Certain things can and certain things cannot be delegated. Jesus might send forth apostles to be His witnesses, and to preach in His name; but He never could have commissioned any one to endure His sufferings or undergo His passion for Him. The essential part of His work He Himself must do. He in His own person must die, in order that men might be redeemed. Without Him the death could have had no merit, and without its merit there could have been no efficacious sacrifice. In a similar sense and way, then, the priesthood of the church is undelegable; it is so of the essence of the body that without it the body could not be. This inseparability of the priestly function from its essence signifies that the church continues Christ's work; and is bound to become, as it were, a colossal personality which lives for the realization of His ideals. Standing as Mediator between God and man, bearing the guilty in its heart, and suffering daily for their sins, yet ever unveiling the face of the Father, and distributing His grace to man who would otherwise perish.

2. But if priesthood and the church are thus indissoluble, what, then, is the ministry? and how is it related to the idea of the church? (i) The ministry must be personal and not official; the man does not become sacred by virtue of the office, but the office is sanctified by the man. The ideal of an official priesthood is mean and poor; because it degrades the office by making it either transmissible or communicable by some outward rite like the laying on of an old and superior official's hands; and because it divorces office from ethics, which our religion, in particular, does not allow, or function from character, and permits one to be reverent to the man as priest while holding in contempt the priest as man. (ii) Where the ministry is

personal, the man is placed in it by the act of God. He alone calls and institutes; the man is responsible to Him alone, and is bound to live and act as in the eye of the Taskmaster, to speak as in the hearing of the Eternal Judge. (iii) Where the ministry is personal and determined by personal relations, it means that (α) the only priesthood possible must spring from the man's organic connection with the collective society and his active obedience to its invisible Head or his moral holiness. (β) The more completely he epitomizes and impersonates the ideal of the society, or reflects and reproduces the character of its Head, the better a minister he will be. (iv) And as he is his ideal will be, and as his ideal is not to institute or conduct "services," whether brief, bright and brotherly or high and solemn, whether "ornate and catholic" or "bare and mean"; but to act and think and speak as if in him Jesus Christ really lived, and was once more serving God by saving man.

B

The second function of Christ which the church ought to fulfil is the prophet's.

1. The prophet is not so much a foreteller as a forth-teller; he teaches by preaching, and he preaches because he sees and knows the truth which is God's, though also the most urgent concern of man. It used to be said that Luther's words were "half-battles"; nay, they were often so full of human courage and so charged with divine strength as to be equal to whole victories. And words that can be so described deserve to be called "prophetic." They put into a man the courage to live, for they speak the mind of a God and a church

which are both alive and militant. When I hear of the reservation of the Sacrament and the awe with which good men think of it, or even regard the receptacle where the symbols are reserved, my soul grows sick at the utter sensuousness even of the religious in the things of the Spirit; but when I see the impatience of man in learning or in listening to the truth which God wishes to have spoken, then my soul becomes stern, because in the presence of a darker sin than the sin of sensuousness. If men would speak for God, they must learn His secret; and if they would learn His secret, then they must spend their days with Him, thinking their way by self-denial and hardness into the inner mysteries of His truth. And he who has been there will love to persuade other men to join the glorious company of the seekers who find in this field the goodliest pearls.

2. Our unsolved practical problems are an innumerable multitude; while the speculative problems which are the vital factors of our practical, form a vaster multitude still. And without the church neither can be solved; and the church cannot solve them apart from the reason and the speech it uses to persuade man. (i) There are large questions as to the Scriptures: — how they came to be and when; what is the text and who are the authors of the books; what is the relation of the narratives they embody to older narratives; what the books severally and as a whole mean, whether we can still speak of them as a revelation and claim for them the rank of authorities in religion. (ii) Then there are large questions as to Christian doctrine: — whether God exists, and whether He created and now rules; how the ideas of creation and growth are related, whether they are contradictory, complementary, or mutually supersessive; how we are to conceive God,

whether as solitary or as social; how we are to conceive Christ, whether as God or as man, or as both; and if as both, in what way are His natures related. And how man is to be conceived, whether as mortal or immortal, whether as individual or as race, whether as, by birth, sinless or sinful, whether as worth redeeming or as infinitely worthless. (iii) And along with these go problems, innumerable and profound, which may be termed ethical, as belonging to applied Christian thought: — how best such thought may be made to permeate and guide, to organize and control the individual, society, and the State; whether it has anything to say to our industrial confusions and conflicts, our economic perplexities and fiscal distress, our political parties and our national ambitions.

3. The church, then, ought not to be dumb in the face of a needy and listening humanity, especially when she is so surcharged with the interpretation of universal and practicable ideals. She is likelier to suffer from want of courage to speak the truth than from any want of truth to be spoken. The world controls the church more subtly and potently than the church can either pervade or control the world. There are fussy laymen and fussy ministers in all the churches; and what each likes best to see is his own reflection in the other's eyes. There are laymen who like to see the minister in the street or on the platform, in the house or in society; acting as secretary of this club or as president of that; marching proudly in the van of one movement or being dragged, ignominously, behind another. Such men seem to think that the Lord takes pleasure in the limbs of a man; and that the minister is better anywhere than where he ought most commonly to be, in the society of God. And there are ministers who are excellent men, though without any prophetic gift; min-

isters who have never themselves kindled with inspired thought or broken into inspired speech; but are well content to deliver their weary weekly tale of conventional commonplace. The church can never ask too much from its ministry if it will only ask the right things; it is certain to ask too much, however little it may be, if only it asks what is wrong. And of its prophetic man, the greater its perplexity the more it is justified in asking. The age will follow if only the church prove that she can and that she will lead; but how can she lead unless she deal with thought honestly in honest speech? John Milton said that if a man believes simply because his priest or presbytery tells him, he is a heretic, even though it be the truth he believes; but if the priest or presbytery has no other reason for faith save the voice of ecclesiastical authority, then the heresy belongs even more to the misleader than to the misled. There is a true and a false apologetic; the church that is always defending herself and her faith is, as a matter of fact, accusing both and condemning both. Faith can be vindicated only in one way, by being realized; and it is best realized when inwardly joined to mind and outwardly incorporated in life and society. Without this daily incorporation of thought in being no church can be justified, and with it none can be condemned.

C

The third function of Christ is kinghood.

1. The church which serves Christ freely shall reign with Him. It can govern only by submitting to be governed; before it can command it must learn to obey. The political dream of a great statesman was a "Free Church in a Free State"; but a "free State" does not mean a state

of anarchy, or a "free church" a church without a head, irresponsible and unbound. Only a church governed can be in the strict sense "free," though its laws must be of its own making. The essence of freedom is not the right to do as we please, but power to do as we ought; and that is the only freedom we can either understand or be enthusiastic about. Such freedom may exist in two forms, as (i) liberty which is internal, freedom of choice, the free will which no coercive impulse, no regnant lust, no sovereign motive can supersede or destroy; and as (ii) freedom which is external, the absence of the restraints that hinder obedience or force it into shapes illicit and unholy. And these two forms imply not only a governed church but its governed members. They obey a higher law than the law of the State, and are justified by their works. There was a fine simplicity in the old struggle of the free churches to be; their right was affirmed on the one side and denied on the other, and though the men who denied it had the power to use "fines," "imprisonment," "exile," and even "death," yet the men who affirmed the right prevailed. Hence we have churches which have so affirmed their right to be "free" as to lie under a more absolute authority than any impersonated restraints which can hinder a completer obedience to the will of God.

2. But these forms of our first principle involve a second distinction: between restraints that hinder the exercise of freedom, which may be removed from without; and liberty, which must be evolved from within. The distinction has its psychological and subjective, as well as its historical and objective justification. The first is, Freedom is matter of choice, not of action; the second is, Liberty forced upon an unwilling people ceases to be freedom and becomes bondage. When France

in her Revolution shook herself free from kings who had ceased to govern, she did it in the sacred name of liberty; and when the monarchs of Europe assembled and tried to compel her to take back the royal brood she had just cast out, she in the same sacred name resisted an act which deserved to be termed tyranny. But when later France mustered armies and sent them over Europe to compel the nations to believe in the rights of man and to become republican and free, she was guilty of a still darker form of tyranny; for it was simple tyranny to try to force upon an unwilling people a polity which they hated. All liberty must, then, come from within and cannot be imported from without. And Christ's freedom is more than freedom from restraint; it is both internal and external. He is the church's inner principle of freedom; its Heart as well as its Head. But He is also its outer principle; its Head as well as its Heart. Within He is the hope of glory; without He is the object of the hope's desire. Where He governs no State can forbid obedience; where He dwells lust ceases to rule, and man is free.

XII

The forces which have ever threatened with danger the church of Christ have been of two kinds, one external, coercive, depriving it of freedom; another internal, debilitative, depriving it of liberty.

1. The coercive and external force has varied from age to age. Once kings were the great troublers of the church, and they sometimes trouble her still. It was the passion of an English king for an impossible uniformity in religion that roused the conscience of our people and

drove thousands of "free-born" Englishmen across the ocean, thus creating, indirectly, the expansion of the English race; and it was the same passion working in the monarch, answered and resisted by men who knew themselves to be citizens of the Eternal City, which evolved into fact the idea that the church to be free must be responsible to its Head alone, thus creating English nonconformity. But from the fear of the king the churches of to-day have been largely emancipated. We may not forget, indeed, that in the colossal empire of Russia the Emperor is even more the head of the church than of the State; and though he may be a gentle and innocent man, yet the system he stands for is neither gentle nor innocent. For both the Russians — Ignatieff and Tolstoi — whose practical Individualism is as strong as their theoretical Socialism is pronounced — know to their cost that an ecclesiastical bureaucracy has no conscience and no heart, and of all calamities to a State there is none greater than a sovereign who must speak as his ecclesiastics will. Infallibility is supremacy in the region of opinion; he who speaks for the whole and to it can, *ex officio*, commit no error. Sovereignty is supremacy in the sphere of legal and civil action — he who is the fountain of law can do no wrong, i.e. cannot be judged by the law whose source he is and whose sanctions he upholds. The sovereignty cannot be absolute which leaves opinion free; while the infallibility must be qualified and conditioned which has to adjust its decrees to the independent State within which it has to live and to whose laws it must conform. But where the head of the State is also head of the church the two principles of Infallibility and Sovereignty are so combined as to form a tyranny which opinion cannot question without being declared by law a rebel guilty of treason and worthy of death. We may say,

then, of the Russian Emperor, that he belongs to a system at once as ancient as paganism, and alien to Christianity, so that he survives as our one *Imperator* who is also *Pontifex Maximus*.

2. But while the churches have, as a rule, been emancipated from the fear of kinghood, other and more terrible forces strive for the place the king once occupied. Commerce seems a beneficent force which ought to make for peace; it binds nation to nation, makes the ocean a pathway between peoples, and appeals to interests and emotions which feel war to be a thing abhorrent. But greed is as ruthless as commerce is beneficent, and the commerce which has become the mere minister of greed is transformed into the fruitful mother of strife. And where greed reigns it spares no ideal of the State and no grace of the church.

As peaceful and kindly commerce ought to unite all nations abroad, industry ought to harmonize all classes into a single society at home. But there is nothing to me more tragic than the wars of industry which are now being waged in all industrial communities. They threaten to split us into fragments, and to substitute for social peace the horrors and the feuds, the desolations and impoverishments of social war. In all our cities there is going on an economic struggle where wealth has no pity for poverty and the poor show no mercy to the rich; where the employer accumulates his millions and the employed husbands his skill; where the one stands by his capital and the other by his labour as if either could be happy without the other or realize existence otherwise than through him. And the struggle which divides society cannot be kept out of our churches, especially as they try to become more socially efficient. The rich man, by the munificent use of his

money, would fain enlist the church on his side; while the working-man, in his congresses and unions, by threats of alienation and final departure, would compel her to further his interests; or, at least, to serve the cause of the millions who labour against the thousands who thrive on their skill. But the church can be the servant of no class, if it is to be the minister of God in behalf of all. It can as little do the will of capital as obey the bidding of labour. To its own Master it standeth or falleth, and its Master is the Christ, whose representative it is. It is bound to do everything for man that man needs to have done for him. It can tolerate no wrong, whether inflicted by man on man or by class on class; but if it is to protect the weak it must remain independent of the strong, whether the strength be that of money or of man, whether of many or of few. Its fundamental principle is: "Because I belong to Christ no class and no man can own me; as His I am the servant of no interest and no person, but of all men and of all classes. Where injustice needs to be punished, wrong reproved, or the weak defended against the strong, I must be on the side of justice, right, and weakness."

3. The debilitative forces which threaten the church's liberty may be described as the fashions, tendencies, and tempers of the time. Two things may here be specified: the reign (i) of Æstheticism and (ii) of Athleticism. By Æstheticism I mean the temper which seeks to gratify the senses as senses rather than as avenues to the spirit; and by Athleticism I mean the glorification of the muscular as the chief quality in man, the cultivation of the limbs as a duty which precedes the cultivation of the soul. It will be most in harmony with our purpose that we, mainly, confine ourselves to Æstheticism in the church. Now, I do not despise a seemly or a stately worship, or a worship

whose acts and articles, however multitudinous, are used as symbols that speak to the spirit of ideas which transcend it. I may deplore the rudimentary notion of religion which finds ceremonial so rich in spiritual significance, even for a Christian man, as to be a necessity for Christian worship; but the notion stands on a higher plane than that which thinks worship excellent just as it pleases man and forgets altogether the glory or the adoration of God. What I despise as profane and vulgar is the idea that our worship is meant to attract men rather than to express our awful joy and penitential prostration before the majesty of God. And this Æstheticism is but an aspect of a dominant and devouring Athleticism. Both Æstheticism and Athleticism are sensuous, the one more secretly, the other more frankly; both dislike instruction and both believe in pleasure, though in the one case the pleasure may be disguised as mock humility, and in the other it may blatantly magnify the muscles and the limbs. Man may need amusement, but the churches ought not to organize themselves with the view of amusing him. They ought to enrich and ennoble, to consecrate and purify happiness; but let it never be forgotten that the church as a society of holy souls exists for the cultivation of holiness; that, as freed from the dominion of the State, it stands under the sole authority of Christ; and that it is meant to be the organ of divine truth, the vehicle of the divine life, the home of divine worship, the bearer of all the agencies which can quicken and regenerate man. If these things be remembered the church will prove herself in all her methods and ends worthy of her Founder and King.

The one thing that can prevent the action of the many debilitating influences that play upon the church is the inhabitation of the Spirit; the indwelling and life of God

can alone free her from the bondage of men and place her under the obedience of Christ. She will then be more governed by the ideals which command her future and less by the traditions which bind her to the past. And this ought to be the case where a church is in a large and honest sense free, where the motto is, the old Adam must die that the Lord from heaven may live; Christ in every man that every man may be a Christian indeed.

XIII

The acts which are properly Christ's and can yet be predicated of the church which is His body, are (i) Incarnation, (ii) Redemption, (iii) Resurrection, and (iv) Eternal Judgment. It is adventurous to say that the church can perform such acts as these. Yet as the Head He cannot do anything without affecting the members; and if He communicates of His own dignity and grace, has any one any right to object? What He does in love we may not refuse to do, especially as His works are ours.

1. There is contained in any theory of incarnation a given conception of God, which is in all thought the regnant notion, and also the mode of His working on, in, and for man. Now, a figure which in Scripture, and especially in the Pauline Epistles, plays a great part in unfolding this double relation, is that of the church with all its members as constituting a body, and its organs,* with Christ as its Head.† Jesus Himself speaks of the chief corner-stone as rejected by the builders, yet as "grinding to powder" every one on whom it falls.‡ The church, then, is, because composed of men, "the body of Christ." § He is its Head,||

* 1 Cor. xii. 12–21.
† Ephes. iv. 15; Col. i. 8.
‡ Matt. xxi. 42–4.
§ Ephes. v. 23; 1 Cor. xii. 29.
|| Ephes. iv. 15.

who rules it,* saves it,† has in it the preëminence,‡ which He has not assumed, but has had it assigned by the Father's will;§ its sacraments He has constituted,|| and its ministers are His apostles.¶ Now, why is the church called "the body"? It is not because it is one, though its members are a multitude — the figure in this sense is old, much older than Paul — but because there is no other way in which an invisible Head can still seem to live and be active among men. And why is Christ termed the "Head of the body"? Not simply because He rules it, and so guides it as to make all its actions rational and worthy of a reasonable being, but because without the Head the body would have no ideas to translate into realities. And the Head without the ideas would be as useless as the ideas without the Head, which is as a home of reason, a suitable home for reasonable things. The reign of the Head therefore signifies that reason governs man, just as the body means the embodiment of its ideas in a divine society. And it is the function of the will which is God, to translate the idealities of the Head into the realities of what we term the body; and of these the noblest is man understood as a collective unity, obedient to God as a humanity which yet has stood face to face with disobedience.

2. Now, this raises the whole question of incarnation, especially as it affects God, who refuses all praise to any "graven image,"** yet pronounces Himself as "well pleased" with Jesus Christ, whom He styled "the

* 1 Cor. xi. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 13; Rev. xix. 16; xx. 4–6.
† Col. i. 20–23; 1 Tim. iv. 10. ‡ Col. i. 18.
§ Ephes. i. 22; Col. i. 19.
|| 1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 23–6; Luke xxii. 19–20; Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 22.
¶ Matt. x. 2–5; Mark iii. 14–19; Luke vi. 8–16; John xx. 21; Ephes. ii. 20. ** Isaiah ii. 8.

Son of His love."* As Christ is the incarnation of the love of God, the church is the incarnation of Christ's Spirit and purpose; the one is as is the other. The church which incarnates is as the Christ who is incarnated. He must be known in order that the church may be understood; and to be known in either the church or the world means that He is known in both, and the faces He turns to God and to man are alike seen. As the Son of God, He implies that love is so of the essence of God, that He cannot love without being benevolent, or be benevolent without being beneficent; and for Him to be beneficent is to be the author of all our good. As "Son of Man," he is no man's son, but child of the race; and such in a double relation: (*α*) as perfect Man, He realizes the image man was created in; (*β*) and as to be perfect is to be holy, and holiness speaks of courage, invincibility by evil, which could not subdue Him. Every man can therefore be Christ-like. Ability is here the measure of obligation, which, fulfilled, brings nearer fulfilment the dream of God. That dream is not realized by individuals being saved, but only by the salvation of society as a whole, or the collective human race. And as both "Son of God" and "Son of Man," the church is His incarnation as He is God's. "He is Head of the Body."

3. Christ is Redeemer, and His work is Redemption. He "gave Himself for our sins, according to the will of God and our Father."† He did not die to buy us back from divine hate, but to reconcile us to divine love. "God is love," and "sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins."‡ And the church exists expressly to continue

* Mark i. 11; ix. 19; Matt. iii. 17; xii. 16; xvii. 5; Luke ix. 35; Ephes. i. 6; iii. 19, etc.

† Gal. i. 4; ii. 20.

‡ 1 John iv. 8–10.

Christ's redeeming work by translating it into fact; and, in the words of Paul, to "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake."* Unless humanity be completely reconciled to God, Christ's work is incomplete; so far as it depended on Himself, He "finished" it, but not so far as it depended on Man. In that connection it can never be finished while one soul remains outside the ends of God; and outside His ends every soul lives who loves sin more than his Maker.

4. The Resurrection of Christ was an act of the Son as well as the Father. It signified that death could not claim the living; that life reigned, and with it immortality. For who can die if he must ever rise again? And what does death become save a change from one form of being to another? And has not the church from Christ's day to this lived an immortal life? Have we not a formula which saith that, while every man must taste death, no society can? Man, like a shock of corn, in his season comes to the grave, and we leave him in the dust, having built over him a tombstone on which has been recorded an epitaph that attributes to him more virtues than he ever possessed. But though communities die often, they have no graveyard, nor does any epitaph record their actions or their merits. And while the church does not die, nor can it, till the last man is reconciled to God, it rises with Christ that it may continue His work, which is also its own.

5. Christ is judge of "quick and dead," and what He is, His church is. It judges men, measures by character, tries them by what they do and what they ought to do. What the church is, man is; and what man is, the eternal Judge proves.

* Col. i. 24.

VI

THE TEACHING OF JESUS IN ITS THIRD PERIOD: THE DEATH

I

1. THE "teaching of Jesus" in its third and final period shows, alike in substance and in mode, differences which, so far from being mere accidents, are rooted in the history, and are, as concerns both events and persons, legitimate outgrowths from it. The changes which affect the substance come from differences in what may be termed, alternatively, either the environment or the background; while the changes which affect the mode proceed from differences in the persons who either live within the environment or face to face with the background. Yet, even as so stated, it is evident that the above antithesis — so far, at least, as the special agents and forms of the contrasted differences are concerned — is not to be construed as absolute, but strictly as relative; for no changed environment or background can affect substance, unless through persons; and where the persons are uninfluenced and think as they always have done, differences do not emerge. Persons cannot therefore affect modes if they live unchanged within a new environment, or still think as they thought when confronted with the old background. What, then, the distinction means is this: there is a double difference, which still is one; every change in the environment is reflected in the

persons who dwell within it, and changed persons signify a changed environment or background. Man, therefore, still holds the key of the situation, which is as he is.

2 We have, then, the old environment and the new: — Jerusalem is substituted for Galilee. And the substitution is twofold, concerns both nature and history.

(i) Nature; Jerusalem as a city was without physical atmosphere, and the only air it breathed was narrow and heated; but Galilee was a province where the atmosphere was broad and cool, and acted on the excited brain as only such an air can. In the city house stood close to house, where they could be left desolate* — and the desolation of the city is awful — and each had its own function, where one could break bread,† or preach in privacy.‡ In it street ran parallel with street or crossed it, and each street had its own fame and designation.§ But in the province man was free to roam up the hillside, and over the plain, and sail on the lake, or wherever streams murmured, trees grew, and flowers bloomed. Every sense of man was pleased. In the city all we see speaks of man and his imperfect workmanship; in the country all man sees praises God and exults in being His perfect work. And in the province of Galilee Jesus feels free; He stands near nature; we listen to her voice as we hear Him. Even the parables which give distinction to the teaching of this middle period are stories based on close observation of the processes of nature; and if man is added, as in the sower who casts abroad his seed, it is only that he may praise her for the wealth she pours into the lap of the industrious.|| But in

* Matt. xxiii. 38. The words were spoken in the Jerusalem period, and with special reference to the city (cf. 37; Luke xiii. 34).

† Acts ii. 46. ‡ *Ib.* v. 42; xx. 20.

§ Luke xiv. 21; Acts ix. 11; Rev. xxi. 21; xxii. 2.

|| Matt. xiii. 8; Mark iv. 8; Luke viii. 8.

the whole of the Jerusalem period the voice of nature is never heard; or, if her voice be heard, it is in an incident, at once symbolical and allegorical, so characteristic of the mood of the moment as the cursing of the barren fig-tree.* The earth mourns;† the race of men marry and are given, heedlessly, in marriage;‡ the deceitfulness of nature and man is insisted on;§ it is the theme of parables;‖ and the beatitude of the good servant who distrusts nature and trusts God is assured; while the "evil servant," who distrusts both, is described as a man who "eats and drinks with the drunken."¶ It is a note, then, of "the teaching of Jesus" in its final form to complain against both nature and man, over against the trust in her and in her impartial fruitfulness which marked His earlier words.

(ii) While neither nature nor history change easily, or without mutual consent, yet of these two history is the more potent. In Palestine this was a well-known truth, which had as its palmary example the relation between Judæa and Galilee. (*a*) The Northern land stood, as regards nature, in waters as in fields, in *fauna* as in *flora*, pre-eminently above the Southern. Both looked at from below and at a distance, say, from the sea and the low-lying cities of the coast, seemed hill-countries; but "the mountains" which guarded Jerusalem by standing "round about" her,** were better to her than the surrounding nature, whose fields were neither "good" nor "flowed with milk and honey."†† "The inhabitants of Jerusalem" were, indeed, said to dwell upon "a very fruitful hill," fenced, and

* Mark xi. 12–14, 20, 26; Matt. xxi. 18–22. † Matt. xxiv. 26–30.
‡ Matt. xxiv. 4–7, 17–19, 37–9; Mark xiii. 5–8.
§ Matt. xxiv. 36, 42–3; Mark xiii. 12–13, 15–17.
‖ Mark xiii. 28, 29; Matt. xxiv. 32–3; Luke xxi. 29–31.
¶ Matt. xxiv. 46–51; Luke, xii. 43–6. ** Ps. cxxvi. 2.
†† Exod. iii. 8; xiii. 6.; Joshua v. 6; Jer. xi. 5; Ezek. xx. 6.

cleared, and planted of God; but when He who planted the "vineyard" looked that it should bring forth choice vines, there came up only "briars and thorns," and the clouds that floated above the land "rained no rain upon it."* This was the simple truth; nature had done all she could, and could do no more, even though Judæa held the city of David; and eyes accustomed to the desert saw all fields that were green as equally good. But (*β*) history here showed her power; she stepped in and changed everything by enlarging and consolidating the North as a province of empire, which she named Galilee. The word which we thus, incorrectly, transliterate originally denoted a "district" or "region" lying either in the mountains of Napthali,† or beyond the sea.‡ It is the name, too, given to the land which had twenty cities on it that Solomon gave to Hiram, King of Tyre,§ or Hiram to Solomon.|| And Tiglath-pileser incorporated the cities of Galilee into the Assyrian Empire.¶ From that time it became a province of successive empires — Persian, Greek, Roman — each more highly organized and with better legislative machinery than its predecessor. Galilee ceased, then, to be a mere region, and took its place properly within an Empire and under Law; especially under laws which dealt with what one would have called the settlement of the alien.**

3. There is nothing that more surprises us in this field than the survival of type. (*a*) Galilee, which began to

* Isa. v. 1–6. † Joshua xx. 7; xxi. 32.

‡ Isa. ix. 1; Matt. iv. 15. See as to *πέραν*, denoting what lies "beyond" or "on the other side," Matt. viii. 18; xvi. 5.

§ 1 Kings ix. 11. || 2 Chron. viii. 2. ¶ 2 Kings xv. 29.

** 1 Macc. v. 15, where *πάσης Γαλιλαίας* is said to be *ἀλλοφύλων ἀλλόφυλος* when used as a substantive denotes (Acts x. 28) a foreigner or heathen in opposition to, or contrast with a Jew, or *ἀνήρ Ιουδαῖος*. Josephus, *Bel. Jud.*, ii, 81, speaks of, incorrectly as it seems, Judas of Gamala as *ἀνήρ Γαλιλαῖος*, a man of Galilee.

be by mixing races, continued to do what it commenced by doing. The Assyrian, the Persian, the Arabian, the Greek, and the Roman were all alike its citizens, and with the native Semite encouraged to retain ancestral religious customs and beliefs. Hence to be a Jew of Galilee was to be a person whose orthodoxy was suspected, just as measured by the correct standard of pronunciation in the capital his "speech bewrayed him." * (β) While even in Maccabean times acknowledged Jews lived in Galilee,† the home of their race was Judæa; in the city of David their temple stood, their God was worshipped, and their religion lived, and there it could alone revive. ‡ Jesus may have felt freer in Galilee than in Judæa,§ where the men were brave, and the very women shared their courage,|| though out of it no good thing or person, like a prophet or the Messiah, could possibly come.¶ (γ) Galilee became, therefore, notorious in Judæa for the stupidity of its inhabitants, but also for their irreligion. If one wanted to see how the dispersion—or how living alongside men of another race—affected belief, one had only to look thither. Latitudinarianism was worse than complete lack of faith, and every Galilean one's eye rested on was certain to be a latitudinarian.

* Matt. xxvi. 73; Mark xiv. 69–70; Luke xxii. 59.

† 1 Macc. v. 17, 20–2. They were known not only by their names, but also by the places whence they came and where they were settled (see v. 26).

‡ John iv. 20–2; Luke xxiv. 44–7.

§ John vii. 1; vi. 59, 66; Matt. iv. 2.

|| Matt. xxvii. 55; Mark xv. 41; Luke xxiii. 49, 55; also Josephus, Antiq.

¶ John i. 46; vii. 40–1, 52; Acts ii. 7; v. 37.

II

1. Out of the changes worked by history within the environment or background come results which we may now summarize: —

(i) The principal person we have to conceive and explain is Jesus, and He is — if conceived aright — as capable of growth as if He were a minor character in history. Why it should be assumed, contrary to all experience, whether written or personal, that He is incapable of development, I know not. Here it is simply postulated as a fact which the Gospel history is wise enough to recognize.*

(ii) Galilee, specifically Nazareth,† is chosen as His home. There were manifest advantages in the choice; the country was freer and more varied than that which lay around either Jerusalem or Bethlehem; He knew the difference,‡ and judged it better to bear a provincial name than to be a son of the capital.§ It is not only that the country which lay round Nazareth was a land of hill and dale, congenial to high thought, or that He could see from its mountains the "blue Mediterranean," or that He luxuriated in its being "full of growth and shade," and dwelt on it as the scene of the greatest of ancient songs, or that He found the wild animals "small and gentle";|| but that it was a good land for men, where they lived not as Semites, or Greeks, or Romans, who each worshipped his own god and followed

* Luke ii. 40, 52.

† Prof. Percy Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 253.

‡ Luke xiii. 1–4.

§ Matt xxvi. 69; Mark xiv. 70; Luke xxiii. 6. How long-lived the reproach was we know from the speech put in the hour of death into the mouth of Julian the Apostate.

|| Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, pp. 67–8.

his own religion, but as neighbours whose speech differed while their hearts agreed.

2. Man, acting according to his nature, judges concerning Religion more tolerantly where his races are many and his religions more mixed, than where there is but one race, and, consequently, only one religion; for in this case he feels freer to play with history as he lists, or to imagine that where there is but one family of pure descent there is only one true religion. And it was so in Israel. The controversies are hotter where religions do not dwell side by side, and where one alone is permitted to live; for then three principles are assumed: (*α*) that God when He instituted His religion so spoke to man directly that He founded it upon personal authority, and not upon human reason and argument; and (*β*) that reason is a frailer basis than authority; and (*γ*) that the multitude of religions is due not so much to reason as to human folly. Man apparently resents more to be judged a fool in his thoughts than to be judged as having no thoughts at all. The question at issue between the Jew and the Galilean concerned two points: — the right of a religion to be and the interpretation of it. There was, therefore, a dangerous rivalry between the two provinces, for it concerned the proper relation of the reason to religion, and of the State to the religious person. The consequent controversy was keen on two points, both of which related to the nature of religion: (i) as to the necessary persons, and (ii) as to the necessary things.

(i) Two orders of persons thought as they embodied certain principles that they were necessary to religion. These were either members of sects: Pharisees, found in both provinces, and Sadducees, peculiar to Judæa; or professional classes,*

* It is here assumed that the Sadducaic party is one with the priesthood (Acts v. 17; xxiii. 6).

like the scribes, whose duty it was to study, and teach and read the law wherever Judaism was; or like the priests, whose function it was to worship God for the people, and who could not therefore be where God could not be worshipped; or they were men known and named, like Gamaliel,* "a doctor of the law," or like Caiaphas and Annas, "chief priests,"† who thought highly of their office because they chanced to fill it, and of Aaron because they were numbered among his descendants. The Pharisee was, as we say, democratic; stood by his people, the nation of the Jews as constituted by the Law, which they were bound to study and obey. He was strongly in favour of the Jewish law and State and as strongly opposed to Rome, just as his rivals, the Sadducees, were friendly and imperialistic. The Pharisee was in temper opposed to Galilee, though not in conviction. On the contrary, his fundamental beliefs compelled to a measure of friendliness; for did he not hold that the law was there to be studied and known? As it was, God was; He and His religion were to be known by study, and therefore the Law had nothing to fear from extension. It is one of the minor notes of truth in the evangelical History that while Jesus is represented as strenuously opposed to the Pharisee, just as the Pharisee is also opposed to Jesus, the opposition is restricted to Galilee; the moment He enters Judæa and Jerusalem He passes out of their hands into those of the Sadducees.‡ It is "the chief priests" who covenant with Judas; § they

* Acts v. 34. † Acts iv. 6; cf. 1 John xviii. 13–14.

‡ The arithmetical test can be here applied, and is most significant. Matthew has over thirty references to the Pharisees, but they completely disappear from the Passion. The nearest they come is in xxvii. 62, which is a story connected with the Resurrection, and they appear in the company of "the chief priests." Mark has in his narrative of the Passion one allusion (xii. 13) to the action of the Pharisees, but Luke has none, though his references are almost as many as Matthew's.

§ Matt. xxvi. 14; Mark xii. 10.

take counsel against Him "to put Him to death," and lay a trap for the Roman procurator to get him to help them.* The chief priests never appear in Galilee,† they appear nowhere save, according to our Synoptic Gospels, in Judæa, or when Jesus teaches that He is to be done to death.‡

(ii) As there are two orders of persons, there are two classes of things, like the Law and the Synagogue, or like the Temple and Worship, necessary to religion; these things are very different, yet essentially connected. The Law was to the Pharisee the Law of Moses; to the Sadducee it was the Levitical Law. The Pharisee was because he was necessary to the Law, but the Sadducee because the Law was necessary to him. The Law involved to the Pharisee the synagogue, which was the symbol of instruction, of obedience or good conduct; but to the Sadducee it was the way in which God could best be worshipped and the theory of who were to worship Him. In other words, the Law was to the Pharisee what it was to Jesus in the "Sermon on the Mount," where there was room for controversy touching what it enjoined, but to the Sadducee it was a law of "carnal commandments," occupied with regulating the descent of the priesthood. As was the Law such was the Synagogue: and as was the worship such was the temple. There was but one temple, as there was one God, so one place where He could be worshipped; Jerusalem was the fit place, the Jews were the fit people, and the Sadducees supplied the fit order, the priesthood.

* Matt. xxvii. 1–2; Mark xv. 1.

† The priests have no function apart from the Temple. One of the features of the Pauline epistles is the avoidance of such terms as "priest" and "chief priest." This is not to be explained by such a flagrant fact as that Paul was by descent and connection a "Pharisee," but simply by his rigorous truth. The "priestly" relation to the death of Christ was not one the priesthood itself would care to remember.

‡ Matt. xvi. 21; xx. 17; Mark viii. 31; ix. 31; x. 32.

III

We have now to consider the change in the mode of the teaching relative to the spirits alike of those who heard it given and of Him who gave it. The entrance into Jerusalem led to a change in the Life and Teaching of Jesus too vast to be unnoted. In all our Synoptic Gospels it is duly recorded, and it begins with Matthew xxi, Mark xi, Luke xix. 28.

1. There was a change in the opposition. This has already been stated. There was substitution of Sadducee for Pharisee, of priest for scribe, of men like Caiaphas and Annas for men like Gamaliel. The difference could be seen in Jesus Himself. He judged the Pharisees more severely; for He felt that His relation to Judaism was conditioned on theirs; that had they instead of tarrying on its threshold seen into its ethical wealth, He had done the same, and so been spared unnecessary speech; that had He begun His career within Judaism and not without He could not have been the victim, which He felt Himself to be, of the Sadducaic priests; and that the Pharisees, who stood so near the kingdom, deserved reproach for not entering it.* On the other hand, He saw as He had not done before into their faithfulness, and did them justice; for he held that while God had two sons to whom he said, "Go work to-day in My vineyard," the elder, who refused, repented, and finally went, was the Pharisee, the younger who answered, "I go," and went not, represented "the smooth-tongued priest";† and that they looked for the sign of the

* If we would measure His wrath against the Pharisee, "who devoured widows' houses and for a pretence made a long prayer," we must read his famous denunciation in Matthew xxiii. 13–33.

† Matt. xxi. 28–30.

Son of Man and watched for the coming of the Lord;* and that while the five foolish virgins typified the Sadducees, the five wise represented the Pharisees.† Jesus spoke hard things about the Sadducees; but He did not condemn them for saying "there is no resurrection," even though "He put them to silence."‡ He warned His disciples against the leaven of the "chief priests," who took an active part in the tragedy of the cross, and assumed its blame and its guilt.§ There is nothing that is blinder than hate, especially hate of the Good.

2. There is in Jesus' own Spirit a change. Wellhausen || is so struck with the change that in his Commentary on Mark he specially notes it, naming the division as occupied with what he calls "the Passion." This change is expressed in the fashion of His works, which are more apocalyptic than of old. When I was young, and the only school of free criticism was represented by the men of Tübingen, it was held that to prove a thing to be apocalyptic was equal to proving it not an original part of the Gospel. In those days Paul was held to be the ultimate and true standard of primitive Christian thinking. What was in his epistles was historically true; what could be shown to be inconsistent with them was demonstrably false. But now matters are changed; it is seen that apocalyptic teaching is genuinely Judaic; or that so far from the Book of Revelation being singular, it is only one among many, which include, indeed, a work so little suspected as the Book of Daniel. Jesus, then, could not have been believed to be a genuine Jewish Messiah, unless He had been apocalyptic; and it is also in keeping with His character that His apocalypse should have been de-

* Matt. xxiv. 30, 40–46. † Matt. xxv. 1–13.
‡ Matt. xxii. 23–34; Mark xii. 18–27; Luke xx. 27–38.
§ Matt. xxvii. 41. || *Das Evangelium Marci*, p. 92.

livered not in Galilee but in Judæa, a land which the city of David with its one temple to Jehovah had made holy, and which was baptized into new holiness by the Maccabees who had struggled against the godless Seleucidæ for freedom to realize religion. Judæa was thus a holy land for the people, who strove to live according to the law of their God; and possessed a literature which as historical represented the past and as prophetic forecasted the future. What is denoted as "apocalyptic literature" is more easily described than defined, especially as definitions have ranged from it as combining "instruction" in the manner of "the Book of Enoch" and "exhortation" in the style of "the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs"* to an attempt "to solve the difficulties connected with a belief in God's righteousness and the suffering condition of His servants on earth."† Neither definition is characteristic; the former is too narrow and fixes on a question of style, which is as true of the earliest as of the latest teaching of Jesus; and the latter is too broad, because it fixes on an idea too little distinctive of "apocalyptic literature," and what it states as its "problem" is too much that of the Hebrew poetical and prophetical books. The analysis necessary to definition must therefore seek to discover the common root of every difference, whether of style and form or of matter. A literary revival may be the event which makes an "apocalypse" possible; but it is too special to be explained by mere general considerations. There were similar phenomena in Greece, as writers so opposed in method and conclusions as Plutarch and Plotinus show; but no one quotes the later Greek literature as "apocalyptic."

3. On the contrary, what is thus named is so imitative

* Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. ii, vol. ii, p. 46.

† *Ency. Bib.*, art. "Apocalyptic Literature."

that while it cannot arise without conscious literary effort, yet it can exist only in harmony with a prior highly esteemed literature. This determines the matter, for no literature can be national which does not preserve the faith of the people; and also the form, for every national literature is canonical. And the kind of literature which lived last and longest in Israel was prophetic, and without God, prophecy which, as understood in the schools, concerned the future, could not be. And "apocalyptic literature" so turns back upon the past as to find there its models and ideals; and so projects itself into the future as to make the future resemble the past it imagines. There is thus a past which is literary, it implies; and a future it, prophetically, describes. It finds the link between the two in the God who guides all things in heaven and in earth according to the counsel of His own will; and as the past it knows, by study only, belongs to a people which was always weak as a nation, it has to speak of the world as a tyrant which seeks not only to oppress the people of God, but in a way that conceals its mind from the oppressor. Hence "apocalyptic literature" speaks of the future in terms it draws from the past, and of the present, which represents an oppressive reign, either in symbolical or emblematic terms.

4. The apocalyptic teaching of Jesus has these qualities: it is given "privately," in response to questions which the disciples put;* it is in the nature of prophecy which concerns the future;† it is cast in a form which reproaches a tyrant, without naming him;‡ it belongs, too, to Jerusalem.§ In it He warns men not to be deceived by false "Christs";|| the coming of the "Son of Man" is secret.

* Matt. xxiv. 3; Mark xiii. 3.
† Mark xiii. 7; Luke xxi. 10.
‡ Matt. xxiv. 6, 7.
§ Luke xxi. 20–21.
|| Matt. xxiv. 5, 23–4, 27; Mark xiii. 21; Luke xxi. 8.

But the final teaching of Jesus has peculiarities of a broader and more general order.

(i) It is concerned with the future to an unusual degree — unusual in His case. The parables He tells,* the questions He answers,† the positive instruction He gives‡ has this purpose in view. We may say, then, His teaching throws its emphasis upon the future and on the judgment, which is conceived as a moral event through its moral issues.

(ii) The question of worship and of man's adoration of God, occupy Him. Hence it is the temple and its worship which mainly attract Jesus; and their whole meaning for the church is what here mainly concerns us. His Passion, which is strictly personal, is its foundation. Hence what bulks so largely in His final teaching is the mystery of His death. Hence we here expound, though from an historical point of view, its meaning.

The Death of Jesus

IV

1. The history which describes the Passion of Jesus Christ is made up at once of facts and allegory: a narrative of events which happened in time, yet the symbol of truths whose home is eternity. Calvary is like a stage where is seen in progress a tragedy that condenses as into a moment the mystery and the meaning of the universe, expressing the innermost mind of the everlasting Father, yet revealing the powers that contend round and for the immortal soul of man.

The still pool or the solitary tarn may, as it looks into the silent face of heaven, reflect either the innumerable

* In Matt. xxi and xxv. † Matt. xxii. 23. ‡ Matt. xxv. 31.

stars, or the radiant sunshine, or the passive moonlight; and so the Crucifixion is like a glass in which we may see standing together, for contrast and comparison, two infinities, the winsome grace of God and the hideous evil of man, especially in the undisguise it wears when it feels conscious of victory. But things never are what evil thinks them to be: — they are not like thought immortal. "There they crucified Him," and though they did not mean it, their cross made Him all the diviner and more imperishable. Calvary can never more fade from the eye, or be razed from the memory or be plucked from the mind of the world, without, indeed, its heart being at the root. And the Cross owes its attractive power to the fact that man has come to read it, not through its hated setting, but through the consciousness of the Crucified. He had come to Jerusalem to die, for there only could the last of the Prophets be offered as the most perfect of all the Sacrifices. He had foretold all He was to suffer at the hands of the chief priests and the elders, and He had foreseen the Cross standing at the end of His way of sorrow. But He did not think of it as the penalty of a crime, rather as the symbol of the death by which He was to give His soul a ransom for many.

2. The thoughts that moved Him found expression in the intimacy of the supper table. There He had told His disciples that He was "to shed His blood for the remission of sins." He rose from the supper and He left the chamber, feeling as a victim anointed to the sacrifice; and He entered Gethsemane. The life was over, the death was at hand; He had ceased to be His own or even to be man's, and had become altogether God's. Yet the mode and moment of the offering sore troubled Him. The idea that the death which was to save man was to be due to the crime of men, penetrated Him with anguish

and created His Passion. Though He had come for this hour, yet He shrank from the hour when He stood in its presence. But He shrank not because of the suffering it involved for Himself, but because of the reproach it was to cast upon the people He loved and for whom He was about to die. He cried to be saved from the hour, though He rejoiced that it marked the moment of His return to the Father. The sad and dreadful tragedy of His destiny seized Him, for while He was exalted by the love of one who suffered as a Saviour, yet He was pierced and pained by the agony of a sufferer who dies at the hands and by the hate of men. And that tragic collision of feeling grew fiercer all through the trial, which had seemed to the priesthood a stroke of genius, yet whose swift-changing scenes He had to watch, the plottings of the priests, the vacillations of the procurator, the instability and the vindictive passion of the people, the weakness and the apostasy of the disciples, the faithfulness of the few, the pity of the women, and the dark and terrible irony of the whole.

But if we analyze the elements that had been pressed into the cup He was to drink, we shall cease to wonder that He prayed the Father to let it pass. There are men who have thought that Gethsemane expressed the Saviour's fear of death. But in so thinking they read themselves into the moment, rather than read the moment through Him. What He feared was not the death, but the part sin played in the death, when there was added to the wanton mockery and hate of men the awful and agonizing idea that the very act by which He saved was an act by which they were to be judged and condemned. In this the mystery of the Passion lies. It describes the agony of the Saviour as He submits to the death which is to save men by surrendering Himself into hands that are swift to do evil.

It was the tragedy of infinite mercy that only by heightening the sin of man could it accomplish his salvation.

3. But the attitude of the priests and rulers to Him was not as His to them; it was the attitude of men who needed a victim and cared not for the rights or the agonies of the victim they needed. They feared, and so they hated; they hated, and so they crucified. This does not mean that the men were wicked, but only that they were zealous for the claims and dignity of their office, and jealous of the Man who was making it seem superfluous or mean. It does, indeed, seem strange that men should have seen anything to hate in Jesus, still stranger that they should have been capable of so hating as to be willing to crucify Him. Was He not holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners? But there is no reproach to a bad man's badness like the goodness of a good man; there is nothing that reproves a false priest like a true priest's truth. And so the men who had no claim to the holiest office were provoked by the character of Him who had received in the highest possible degree the vocation of God. They therefore called a council and considered what they should do with One whose words were troubling their State. The policy which commended itself to them was formulated by the chief priest: "It is expedient that one man die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." * What he meant was that their craft was in danger, and that it was better that He who endangered it should die than that their craft should cease. He did not ask why One who was in character and function a true priest of God should endanger the priesthood that had risen by the ordinances and for the convenience of men. It was enough for him to know that his office and his order were threatened, to feel justified in

* John xi. 50.

sacrificing the blameless and beautiful Person who was the unconscious cause of danger to "the nation," i.e. "the priesthood." And his words seemed to the assembled council the voice of wisdom which as applied became high statesmanship. Yet cunning is the contradiction of wisdom. The cunning man is a disguised fool, driven to seek the readiest way of escape from the consequences of his own folly.* And so the council was composed of simple yet cunning men, whose mean expedient of crucifying Jesus caused, without saving the people, the supreme tragedy of time. But it occasioned the coming of a Divine revenge. Jerusalem, anxious for her own safety, perished; round her the Roman drew his iron and impenetrable lines; her proud temple and her lofty towers were levelled with the dust, and she became a smoking ruin, with barren salt sown upon the place where Zion once stood, "beautiful for situation" and the "joy of the whole earth." But love of the Crucified has given her an ideal and eternal existence in the faith of men. Athens, the eye of Greece, may stand to all ages as the home of beauty and of culture; Rome, the seat of empire, may have seemed the symbol to her own people of eternity, as to us of political power; but Jerusalem is, above all other cities, the symbol of religion, and over the very turmoil in which she perished we seem to see stretched the sceptre of eternal righteousness. And this idealization she owes to the Cross; Calvary has made her sacred for evermore.

V

1. It is needful, then, to distinguish the accidents of the death of the Saviour from His Passion, and the Sacrifice

* This passage is a reminiscence of one in the *Miscellaneous Thoughts* of Jonathan Edwards, where he credits the devil with cunning, but denies him wisdom.

which was all His own. Man's part added to the sufferings, but not to the merit of the sacrifice or the efficacy of His work. Men contributed the setting; but His person created and constituted the act. Their part sprang from the lower passions which characterized Satan when, looking into the moral feebleness of selfishness, he said, "Skin for skin; yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life."* Christ's act came out of the grace which, "though rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich."† And each part so relieved the other as to heighten the collective effect.

2. Thus, when the priests had secured not only His capture, but also His trial and His condemnation by the Roman governor, their vindictive anger, as by a stroke of ironical genius, contrived the means at once of expressing their spite and of increasing His pain. (i) He had spoken of God as His Father — and certainly if ever such a name for God fell fitly from a human tongue it was from His. And He had described Himself as God's Son — and if ever man could think of any one as Son of God then it must be a person such as He was. But the priests, when they had Him on the cross, helpless, vanquished, dying, gratified their lust of hate by breaking into jibes: "He trusted in God: let Him deliver Him now if He desireth Him." "If Thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross." (ii) They had seen Him work miracles — and did not dare to deny the miracles He worked, though they had tried to explain them by invoking the power He had come to overthrow. But now they had discovered the limits of the power they feared: it had availed for others, but did not avail for Himself; and so in their delight at the discovery they went to and fro before

* Job ii. 4. † 2 Cor. viii. 9.

His cross and cried, "He saved others, Himself He cannot save." (iii) They had seen that He was without blame, and they had been silent when He asked them whether they could convict Him of sin; but now they had found a way of making Him seem guilty of the sin they had failed to discover. When Pilate had set before them Jesus and Barabbas and asked which of the two they wished to have released, they had chosen Barabbas, the "robber";* and had left Jesus to endure the cross and bear the reproach of being the greater culprit. And when He was led forth to die they placed Him between two "malefactors," as if to damn Him still further and to drench His holy name in the associations of hateful crime. They imagined that they had made it impossible for those who had loved and followed Him, and lived in the light of His magnificent eye, to idealize the form or glorify the nature of Him whose sun had set on the cross, tarnished and blackened as by two immense clouds of darkness standing on each side of His glory, the "malefactors" who were crucified with Him, "one on His right hand and the other on His left."† As they looked on their handiwork, they may well have thought that they were indeed victorious men, for had they not seen by the grace of their own craft their foe perish?

3. But had these priests never read in their own Psalms, "Surely the wrath of men shall praise Him"?‡ And if ever the wrath of men broke into a song that glorified God, it was now. All the acts suggested by the genius of hate became at the touch of the Crucified changed into signs and occasions of grace. Jesus on the cross behaves like the Redeemer of the world. What had been designed to mock and insult Him turned in His hands into a new oppor-

* John xviii. 40; cf. Luke xxiii. 19–25; Mark xv. 7–11; Matt. xxvii. 15–21.
† Luke xxiii. 33; John xix. 18. ‡ Ps. lxxvi. 10.

tunity for the expression of Divine love and truth. (i) They mocked Him when He cried in His agony like one forsaken of God: for how could He as man descend into the darkness of the grave without the common human shrinking before that darkness and at the touch of its cold and awful hand? But, whatever sense might feel, how could God forsake the spirit of His Holy One? And has He not shown how near God had come to Him in death when He recalled Him from the grave and exalted Him to His own right hand? (ii) His resurrection is no child of the human imagination, without any meaning or warrant save such as it owes to eye-witnesses; it is a fact of Divine inspiration and spiritual experience. From then till now He has lived and reigned, and been to the ages that stand between Him and us, not only living, but the very cause of their life. (iii) The men who mocked gloried in having found the limits of the power which He could no longer use to insult their impotence. But the hour of miracles was for Him only beginning: the reign of His grace was to have as its symbol the very instrument they had expected to extinguish His name. For at His touch the cross lost all its associations of horror and crime and death, and gathered round it the attributes of a pity that never slumbered, a mercy that never failed, a love mightier than the grave. He received it steeped in all the shameful memories of the scaffold where crime had expiated its guilt; and He transmuted it into the symbol which has been carved on the tomb of those we have loved and lost, to express a hope that lives in the face of death; and a symbol which has been borne on the breast of the crusader or the banner of the warrior, to speak of a victory that could know no defeat; which has marked on the field of battle the spot where carnage ceased and where began the ministry of healing which knew no man

as friend and none as foe; but as a man who, wounded, needed to be nursed, or as the sick who wanted to be cured, or the dying who waited to be consoled. It is a symbol, too, which has been made to adorn the grave of the martyred saint, or to speak to a race lost in evil of a God that could not let it go or leave it to perish in its s n. (iv) The very "malefactors" who had been selected to overshadow His fame, and give infamy to His end, were made to illustrate the grace that dwelt in Him in the very hour and article of death. They were placed the one on the right hand and the other on the left, that like two pillars of darkness they might the more utterly quench His light; but His light shone through the darkness and made the pillars luminous with infinite significance. The one malefactor realized his sin and sorrowed unto penitence; while the other, craving a life he did not deserve and never had honoured, passed through his impenitence to a death he was too hardened to fear.

VI

1. The whole story of the Cross thus turns into a Divine allegory. Jesus stands in the midst of time and of sin, with a world touched into penitence on His right hand, and on His left a world hardened into impenitence and shamelessness. He touches both and is touched by both, while both show their essential qualities at his touch. The most offensive things that mockery could imagine and hate could do but seemed to make His face, even in its sorrow, radiant with a love too divine to be extinguished. If, then, the Cross be read as at once fact and allegory, event and symbol, what are the ideas it expresses to us?

(i) It shows that the Cross is common to man; and

each of us has first to bear it and then be borne on it. The three who were crucified together formed a strange trinity of sufferers: the bad man who as impenitent loves and clings to his badness; the bad man who as penitent abhors and renounces it; and the holy, the beautiful, and the gracious Son of God, stand together in the fellowship of pain, are joined in the common brotherhood of the Cross. Evil casts a shadow across the universe from which even God may not escape. The little child that does not know its right hand from its left, knows pain and death; the hero who would rather die a thousand times than have his name tarnished by dishonour, falls a victim to the revenge or cowardice or greed of some mean and contemptible traitor; the fond and trustful woman who loves neither wisely nor well, is made the victim of some base man's lust, and becomes an outcast from the society that will neither forget nor condone her sin, though it will hasten with soft and willing feet to forgive and forget the guilt of her seducer; the simple and the unworldly who have a little money to invest, trust it to some commercial vampire who lives on the blood and substance of the simple, then lose it all, and come face to face with gaunt and pitiless poverty. The Cross has many forms; it is universal, it stands in every highway and by-way of life; and in all we meet men who bend under its weight, and carry the bier that will yet carry them.

(ii) And while the Cross is common, it is unequal in its pain and pressure, like a burden unevenly distributed on the shoulders of men. The stalwart villain carries a weight he hardly feels; he is carried by the cross without caring for its shame, while he hardily bears its pain. The gentle and pitiful carry their cross and feel it a burden beyond their strength. They fall before their Calvary is reached,

exhausted by the steepness of the way. And it is heaviest of all where the blamelessness is most complete. He who ought, if holiness had meant enjoyment, to have gone through life gaily as to the sound of minstrelsy, bears the saddest and most tragic Cross of all time, a Cross which can be represented neither by the wooden instrument of death, nor by pierced hands and feet, nor wounded side. This Cross cannot be measured or weighed or figured, for it is inner, the sorrow of the heart that breaks for sin, the pity which turns the vision of evil into a suffering that is sacrifice.

2. But here a question too grave to be passed unnoticed calls for discussion. Why did the Holy Son of God so suffer? In this question there are several principles, chiefly two: (i) Why, in a world which love made and which righteousness governs, do the innocent suffer with the guilty? and (ii) How does the Sorrow of the Saviour stand related to our salvation?

(*a*) The principle that must guide us in our answer to the first point may be stated thus: Man makes sin, but God sends sorrow, and where the sin has been made no more beneficent messenger than sorrow can be sent even by Heavenly Grace. Were there no suffering in a world where evil is, it would mean that its Sovereign cared as little for the evil as for the good; that He was indifferent to both, and views without concern the departure of man from the obedience that is holiness and peace. He sends suffering that He may chastise the evil-doer, and move him, through the knowledge of his sin in its fruits, to a penitence which he would otherwise not dream of seeking. Dark is the shadow which sin has cast upon time; and our world, as it wanders through space, lies cold and bleak in the night wind that rises from the

swamps of its own wrong, and comes laden with damp mists and death. But across the dark there runs a golden band of sunlight, that grows ever wider and falls with ever directer ray upon the sore heart of the weary vagrant; and this band is made by the sorrow which comes from God and leads back to Him. (β) And there could be no remedial suffering for the guilty unless the innocent suffered with him. For are they not both of one kin? and how is it possible that the kindly innocent could be without sorrow when he sees his sinful kin enduring the chastisement that is his due? Blood is thicker than water; the bond it forms between men is strange and potent and infrangible, and will not allow those of one blood to be indifferent to each other's fate. (γ) Sin is certain to pain the good more than the evil; and transgression may well be a more terrible thing to an archangel's eye than to a devil's experience. On the white face of the snow a black spot will seem more densely black than when it lies against a background faded and flecked and grey. And so to the soul that has never sinned evil will seem a darker and more hideous thing than it will to the soul that has never seen holiness or cared to see it, that has no associations of unsullied white to bring out the dismal blackness that lies around and lives within it.

3. The suffering of the innocent with and for the guilty has a twofold significance: (i) it is the touch of nature which shows the kinship of the good with the evil; and (ii) it is the effect of the clear and single eye that, seeing sin as it is, makes holiness mourn for guilt. (i) And in the suffering which is thus caused there lives a remedial power. The sinful never so know their sin as when they see sorrow for it incorporated in one who did no evil and yet suffered from the wrong. The sight of a father going

down in sorrow to the grave, his hair whitened with shame for sin he never committed, his heart broken with regret for wrong he never wrought, has wakened remorse in many a profligate who had never known he had a conscience and had but gloried in his shame. The sudden apparition of a mother seeking a fallen daughter — as Mary may have sought her buried Lord — and not able to see for her blinding tears, has sent the daughter weeping back into her yesterdays, seeking the innocence she knew in her childhood and lost with her happier days. And so the Cross, speaking to men of the Passion of God for their sin, sets them, as it were, back in the heart of Deity, and therefore causes them to see sin as with the Divine eye, to judge it as with the Divine conscience, to hate it with a Divine hatred, and to avoid it with the unconscious serenity and sureness of the Divine will. (ii) And the mysterious force by which the Cross compels man to feel sin as God feels it, it does not lose with the lapse of time. The farther we travel down the ages the nearer the Cross comes to us: the flight of time is a movement towards it. Its memory does not fade with the years, but we can say of it what was said of a more earthly love,

> Time but the impression stronger makes,
> As streams their channels deeper wear.

The infinite grace that speaks in it moves with a swifter step than soft-footed time even in its most rapid strides. It is indeed to state no paradox, but only the most obvious fact, to say we feel nearer the Cross and the Crucified to-day than did the Roman centurion who cried as he witnessed the last agony of the Saviour, "Truly this is the Son of God."*

* Matt. xxvii. 54; Mark xv. 39; cf. Luke xxiii. 47.

VII

1. But we must turn from this digression — if digression it be — to the persons and events described in the sacred history, which together answer the second question. As we continue looking at those who were crucified together, their differences in character are invested with more significance than their similarity in fate. It is strange how little we know of these malefactors; they touch Jesus at the moment of His death, and the touch has made them immortal. Who they were, and what their names, from whom they had descended, where they had been born, and where they had lived, or what they had done to bring them to the cross, we know not; we only know that they were crucified with Him. Yet can we be said to know a man if all we know is a single moment or event in his career? No moment stands alone; it is the child of an innumerable multitude of moments that went before it, and the parent of an innumerable multitude that will come after it. And unless we can read it in its connection we cannot interpret it. For it is impossible to cut a section out of a man's life, isolate it, and understand it in its isolation. It is only as it rises out of his past and creates his future that it has for us any intelligible meaning or speaks to us any vital truth. How, then, can we know these men without a past, living before our eyes but for a single brief moment? Malefactors they may be; yet why did the one remain impenitent, and why did the other become penitent? What made the one blind to the significance of the Saviour and the other as if he were all one open vision sensitive to the truth, we cannot tell.

Still, we may construct for them a possible past to ex-

plain their present difference. We may, then, imagine that rather more than thirty years before this fateful moment three children were born to three several mothers. Birth, indeed, is everywhere a marvellous thing. We speak of the world as old, but it never can be old so long as young life continues to rise within it. The last new child is to the last new mother as wonderful as was her firstborn to Eve, when she exclaimed, "I have gotten a man from the Lord."* Birth keeps the soul of the world young, touches it with wonder, fills it with the love that is akin to religion.

2. And if we think of these three births as happening near each other in space and in time, yet we may not think of them as all alike wonderful to the imaginations of the persons who saw the little children come.

(i) The first of them we may suppose was born to a hunted woman in a cave where wild men, outlaws, enemies of order and justice, had made their home. In the inaccessible hill-country the robber had his haunt, and in the cave where he dwelt there blended one day with the voices of the lawless men, whose only use for the name of God was to garnish the frequent and brutal oath, the piercing yet helpless cry of a babe. And the babe grew into the child, who heard only the savage voices round him, speaking their wild minds or breaking into fierce curses; and as he knew no other men, he learned to think their thoughts, to conceive society as they did, as an organized hypocrisy; the honest man was but the plausible knave who acquired in a secret, silken way the goods which the robber by open and manly violence possessed himself of, in order that he might serve, if not the common, yet his own peculiar weal. And so the child, having no opportunity to become a being of another order, grew even as the men were, learned profane speech as his

* Gen. iv. 1.

mother tongue, heard no noble thoughts expressed, saw no chivalrous deeds done, but, inured from childhood to profligacy and to wrong, he grew into crime, committing it as one to the manner born, who knew no law save the will of the robber chief who by the fear of his strength and the love of plunder ruled the wild men of the cave.

(ii) The second child we may imagine as born about the same time in the house of a priest or rabbi. Wonderful he seemed to the mother, trained to think of the Lord as "the Giver of every good thing";* wonderful he would have seemed to the father had public duty ever permitted him to think of his own child. By day the father had to minister in the temple at the altar, or to attend the Sanhedrin, or to do some one of the multitude of things that fell to him as a priest or ruler of the people; and when he came home at night he was too fretted, too weary or worried, to care to see or to teach his boy, who, untamed by a masculine and authoritative mind, grew up, indulged but undisciplined, petted, uneducated, the apple of a mother's eye, the neglected incident of a father's life. He learned in earliest days to repeat by heart the psalms or hymns the mother loved. But he was wayward, and she feared that the inflexible father, if he knew the waywardness of the son, would be more inflexible in his behaviour and severe in his punishment than even was his wont. So she hid the boy's misdoings, till in a moment of unwonted temptation he committed a misdeed that could not be hid; and he fled from his home and the consequences of his act to the society of the wild men in the hill-country and to the shelter of their cave. And so it happened that the two men, who had been born so far apart, had lived together, robbed together,

* Cf. James i. 17.

together been captured and condemned, and now together they had come to the cross.

(iii) But very different had been the character and history of the third Child, though by a tragic mischance He seemed joined in final fate with the other two. He had come to bring "peace on earth, good will toward men."* But He brought these gracious gifts by enduring hate, insult, and insolence at the hands of men; what has been described as "the contradiction of sinners."† He lived in beautiful simplicity as a child, in holy obscurity as a boy, doing His father's business while nursed in the piety of an humble home; and in due season He became the Teacher, the Master in Israel, the Light and also the Life of the world. But there is nothing so impatient of difference as convention, nothing that can so little bear to be crossed or thwarted as custom; and the very preëminence of His goodness made Him hateful to men whose conventions had authority, whose customs were law, but whose natures were neither humane nor holy. And they hated Him for His truth, they disliked Him for His goodness, and they were jealous of the admiration the people gave to His words and acts. But they were men of public dignity and place, and so, clothing their hate in judicial forms, they tried Him by a standard which, while it did not apply to His character and claims, yet legally brought Him to the cross.

3. And so these three, so unlike in history, so much more unlike in character, now meet together in what seems an identical fate.

But this fateful association affects each of the three persons in a strikingly dissimilar yet most characteristic way. The character and the person of Jesus at once declared them-

* Luke ii. 14. † Heb. xii. 3.

selves by acting on the two malefactors as a discriminative and separative and judicial authority. The association of the two evil-doers had but tended to increase their activity in crime and their pride in violence; but their association with Jesus revealed most significant differences between them — showed how in one the evil that would not respond to good hardened into impenitence, and how in the other reminiscences of good surviving amid evil broke into penitence and a confession that at once ennobled the man and exalted the Saviour. The association, then, is not due to insignificant accident: the malefactors have each a function splendidly fulfilled: they form a background which throws into relief the person of Jesus, and helps us to see into His spirit and read the meaning of the Passion whose outward expression is the Cross.

VIII

1. There is first the impenitent man: he has much to regret, but he regrets nothing; worthy of death, he yet confronts it thoughtless as to his past, careless as to his future. While blame is most of all due to himself, he yet blames the Blameless, and rails as if the fault were His; though divided from Jesus by as vast a gulf as separates hell from heaven, he is yet so unconscious of the difference and the distance between them that he dares to associate himself with the Christ in the demand, "Save Thyself and us." * The man has so lived as to learn nothing that was worth learning, even concerning himself. He does not know the godlike possibilities once latent in his own nature; he is blind to the infinities within as well as around him, to the

* Luke xxiii. 39.

true nature of the evil he has done, to the guilt and the misery which indulgence in it had brought. He can, like other fools, "rush in where angels fear to tread"; and with equal shamelessness, on the one hand, mock at sin, though only to find at the bitter end the mocking thing it can make of him; and, on the other hand, he scorns the pity which, undiscovered, beats and breathes beside him, potent in the Divine strength to help even on the cross. The man had suffered, chastisement had come to him as it comes to all; conscience had spoken, truth had pleaded for a hearing; but he had loved evil, had followed crime, and it had led him to the bitterest of all ends, where he stands face to face with death, blind to the Divine pity that suffered by his side, railing at it because it loved him too well to lift him back into the life where he would be free to sin once more. It was better that he should go into eternity, and there learn to think more truly of himself, his sin, and his God.

2. The penitent is a man with a past in which good and evil had so mingled as to affect his present and the attitude his mind assumed to death and the cross. His memory is so charged with reminiscences of the higher things he had once learned, as well as the baser things he had done later, that the two currents meet, conflictingly, in the experience of his final moments. And here he is able to find in the latter a test to determine the character and the quality of the baser things. And he is so conscious of the wickedness of his past, of the guilt of his present, of the awful event which forces a spirit clothed in its crimes into the dread mysteries of death and eternity, and, above all, into the presence of the Eternal Judge, that he is in a mood to be touched by the pitiful tragedy of the Cross. He feels that men who bear it ought not to rail at one who bears it

with them; for they are "in the same condemnation," * and ought to feel the solemn sanctity of their common shame, and sorrow, and calamity. For himself, he knows that he deserves to die; his crimes have made his cross, and now he blames not the cross but the crimes. "We indeed [die] justly, for we receive the due reward of our deeds." † But in the very degree that he is conscious of his own evil he perceives two things: (*a*) how that evil intensifies the tragic significance of death, and (*β*) how it magnifies the goodness of Him who is dying without crime — the Man who "has done nothing amiss." To be twins, born of one mother, with the same blood in the veins, to have lain in the same bosom and drunk from the same breasts, is to be alike not simply in descent and home, in face and feature, but so akin in spirit and in temper as to be nearer and dearer to each other "than common man is to common man." But to be twins in death, born into eternity at the same moment, and by the same event, is to have a sanctity that will abide for ever. And still more remarkable than his vision of the sanctity of the moment is that of the sacredness of the Person beside him. A man who dies because he is too good to live must be as far above the ordinary level and customary ideals of the multitude as one who dies for his crime is below them. And so this man's moral eyes are opened, and he sees a wonderful thing — the Christ in the Crucified; while behind him there stretches a dark and gloomy past, there is beside him a radiant and holy Person, and he sees between the dark and the bright the rainbow of promise, the beautiful arch of God, adown which the celestial messenger of peace travels with its message of grace to his spirit. And through the light this made about his soul the man beholds beside him the Victor

* Luke xxiii. 40. † xxiii. 41.

over Death and the Grave and the Cross. "Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom."*

3. But if these two men are distinguished by evil in the one being hardened and good in the other evoked and vivified by the person of Jesus — they, in their turn, combine to make Him more lucid and intelligible to us than He had been before. He has no evil to regret; He is not haunted by a past that holds Him by the twin hands of horror and remorse. He is all radiant within, though there is behind and about Him a background of desertion and shame. Love dwells within Him; obedience has built for Him the Cross. The Father whose apparent desertion had forced from Him an exceeding bitter cry, is near Him, for had not angels come to strengthen Him in the Garden?

IX

1. But all the more because of the radiant holiness within He sees the meaning of the scene which is proceeding before His face. The scorn of the priests, the anger of the people, the hateful cries of the men who hate the more that their victim is He from whom they had expected the redemption of Israel — all have a meaning plain to His clear and open sense. Yet of all things the least possible to present to the human imagination is the consciousness of our Lord at this supreme moment of His passion. But let us try to think of what He may have experienced under some material form. Let us imagine an immense spiritual being, sensitive through and through, under the figure of an enormous canopy stretched over the earth. On the upper or convex side of it, turned towards the serener and more radiant heaven, there falls the everlasting sunlight which is the smile of God. It

* Luke xxiii. 42.

hears the songs of the angels in Paradise, is swept by the wings of ministering spirits, and thrilled by feeling near it the celestial hosts who have come to succour Jesus in His sorrow. But its concave side, which is turned to earth, hears the groans and sighs, the curses and the mad laughter of time. The oath of the man who thinks of God only as the minister to his hate; the prayer of the woman forsaken of love and bearing within her the legacy of lust; the wild song of the drunkard; the mocking prayer of the hypocrite; the spiteful and vindictive cries of the successful plotter over his victim — these all rise and penetrate the cave which bends like an immense arch of life over our earth. And then, as the upward tide of piercing and painful sound meets the downward tide of radiant and harmonious bliss, can we imagine the miserable joy, the happy delirium, the awful passion of emotions in which love and horror blend; each in its own degree transcendent yet so interfused as to create an indecomposable and indescribable unity in that listening spirit? Even such was the cross to Christ and Christ on the cross. Need we wonder why He broke into the cry, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"* Must it not have seemed as if the rampant evil of earth had not simply contradicted but overwhelmed the radiant God of heaven? But the mood out of which that cry came passes; and as the cry dies away two things emerge, speaking of the infinite faith that bade the Saviour rejoice in the very hour of His passion. The one was His word to the dying and penitent thief, "To-day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise";† the other was His surrender of Himself to God: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit."‡ The first signified that Paradise was to Him already an experi-

* Matt. xxvii. 46. † Luke xx. 43.
‡ Luke xxiii. 46; cf. Matt. xxvii. 50.

ence, present and assured, that He had power not only to enter it Himself, but to bring His faithful with Him. The second signified that when the shock of the colliding forces had passed, the hand of God still held Him, and He knew the face of God to be looking upon Him in everlasting tenderness.

2. But we have not yet exhausted the significance of the Cross, and the figures which are so placed as to enhance the grace and the power of Him who is in their midst. The one malefactor shows us evil at its best; the other, evil at its worst. There are men, indeed, who think that the difference between them may be traced to the will of God, forgetting that a difficulty lifted from the will of man into the will of God is magnified rather than diminished. The difference, so far as their evil is concerned, must be sought in themselves, though the source of all good is to be found in God. The impenitent man shows evil at its basest, the heart obdurate, insensible, unconscious of its own quality and character and deserts. I have heard men describe the miseries which attend the deathbed of the ungodly, invoking in proof the cries of agony and despair with which they have splintered the drowsy ears of death. Voltaire is said — though falsely — to have begged a little more time for life and repentance: and the stricken sinner has asked for six months wherein to make his peace with the God he had all his life long been proud to despise and disobey. But these are hopeful and gracious signs: for there is something infinitely worse than the agony of a conscience that will not be silent in the face of death; there is the obduracy, the dumb indifference, the heartwholeness in the presence of mortality. The man who lives after a great sin as if he had never sinned, and who dies in the odour of respectability and is buried amid the

praise of the conventional and well-to-do, is a more hopeless sinner than Cain, who cried, "My punishment is greater than I can bear,"* or than Judas, who could not bear to live after he had betrayed his Master. Of this worst kind of sinner the impenitent thief remains the type. He dies a sinner who feels as if he had not sinned, believing that the best thing God can do with him is to save him from the death he deserves and let him live to do wrong as of old.

3. But the penitent man shows evil at its best; the good nature resurgent within the bad, pleading to be saved from the body of death that it may become spirit and live as God liveth. And between these two we see Jesus in the moment of supreme agony tasting supreme joy, feeling His "thirst," feeling also His work to be "finished," yet feeling that ere it can be described as ended the man who has spoken to Him in penitence and faith must be saved. And as the word he uttered speaks of Himself as well as to the dying man, we may imagine the two entering Paradise together: the Saviour with the penitent thief as the first-fruits of the saved. And when the saint new to heaven is met and guided through its crowded ways, the guide who meets and conducts him to the centre of light points out two figures — the Lamb on the Throne and one who humbly sits upon its steps; and then he says, "There is the man who in the hour and article of death believed on the Christ, and there is the Christ Who in the same hour saved the man."

* Gen. iv. 13.

VII

PAUL THE APOSTLE OF JESUS CHRIST

WHAT we have now to study is men who may be regarded as fair examples of the material Jesus used to build His church of. We take two: one who was in the circle of original disciples and one who was not, John and Paul. With the last-named we begin, our purpose being to follow the literature of the New Testament.

I

1. Differences of character may be divided into two classes, which may be named, respectively, the accidental and the essential. Accidental differences, which are due either to history or experience, may be described as acquired; while essential differences, which are made with the man and are as old as he, may be said to be either constitutional or implanted. What we have termed "accidental differences" may yet denote qualities of character as profound and impassable as those called "essential," and may well regulate history. But a further distinction, in order to greater precision of language, must, as a necessary consequence, be introduced: — The qualities termed "essential" are independent of experience and prior to personal history because they belong to the essence of the man and are created in him; but those termed

"accidental" are dependent upon experiences and subsequent to personal being. Now Paul had, as respects character, both classes and kinds of differences. He was parted from Jesus and the older apostles by the class which we have termed "accidental," and from Jesus Himself by the class we have termed "essential." The qualities we call "accidental" are distinctively Pauline, and express points where Jesus and the older apostles stand together opposed to Paul. But the qualities we call "essential," which denote personal and absolute differences, belonged rather to Jesus than Paul, and place Him in antithesis to all the apostles.

2. Our first concern is with the qualities called "accidental," which distinguish Paul alike from Jesus and the other apostles: (i) Paul is proud of the fact that he, alone among those who made and founded Christianity, was born outside Palestine, and is able to speak as a native the tongue of the Gentiles, whose missionary he is.* He is a Tarsian, the man from Tarsus.† (ii) He is the only writer in the New Testament who boasts his descent from Jews.‡ His birth, as well as progress in Judaism, and his zeal for his ancestral traditions, are to him matters of pride.§ (iii) He boasts also that he himself is a Pharisee and the descendant of Pharisees,|| a convinced member of the narrowest and most zealous Jewish sect.¶ (iv) He, as an educated man, is the only apostle who uses his Jewish learning to transcend

* Gal. i. 16; ii. 8, 9. The very fact that Paul spoke the common tongue, which was a form of Greek, as only a native could, marked him out as a fit missionary. Cf. Acts ix. 15; xiii. 46; xv. 3, 14, 17, 19.

† Acts ix. 11; xxi. 39; xxvii. 3.

‡ 2 Cor. xi. 22; Rom. ix. 3, 4; Gal. ii. 15; Phil. iii. 5.

§ Gal. i. 14; Acts xxii. 3. || Phil. iii. 5; Acts xxiii. 6–8.

¶ Acts xxiv. 3; xxvi. 5. Legarde, who cannot well be otherwise than ironical, speaks of him as a Jew and a Pharisee, even after he had become a Christian (*Deuts. Schriften*, 1886, pp. 71, 78).

Judaism;* the man, therefore, who, as the one schoolman in the New Testament, is most intelligible to the Rabbis, and the one they think they can best understand.† The fact that he, as an apostle, is skilled in the use of scholastic learning, means that he alone possesses it. (v) He is the only apostle who claims to be a Roman citizen,‡ and he alone knew what the claim meant.§ (vi) He is the only apostle who alludes to the fact of his conversion, which he ascribes to God. He separated him from his mother's womb and called him through His grace;|| and he testifies that the only good the church knew of him was that he "preached the faith which he was wont to destroy."¶ (vii) While God made Paul like the other apostles out of the clay whereof ordinary men are fashioned, yet we may say that He took extraordinary pains with his education. He meant him not only to understand the Gentiles, but the Christ he had to preach.** Now Jesus and the men He called to be His apostles, who were one and all natives of Palestine, were also distinguished from Paul as uneducated and untutored; men who had gone out to seek comfort of John, and were "baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins."††

3. Jesus in essential quality of being stands distinct alike from Paul and the older apostles; i.e. he is separated from them by qualities and traits which may be described as at once personal and essential. (i) History moves in the region of senses which are yet too intellectual to be wholly sensuous; and it deals with what, as adventitious and incidental, can be seen and handled. Jesus seems to stand above Paul by virtue of His spirit, which is built of rarer

* Gal. i. 14. † 2 Cor. xi. 6; iii. 6, 7, 13, 14.
‡ Acts xvi. 36, 37; xxii. 25–28.
§ Acts xvi. 38, 39; xxii. 29, 30; xxiii. 27, 29, 30.
|| Gal. i. 15. ¶ Gal. i. 13, 22, 23. ** Gal. i. 16.
†† Matt. iii. 6; iv. 18; Mark i. 4, 5, 16–20; Luke iii. 3, 21; v. 10, 11.

material, and can, therefore, as more completely incorporated with the race, in an exceptional degree, feel the sins and the sorrows of man, and by His sympathy share its weakness.*

(ii) History justifies the Pauline emphasis on the pity that moves Jesus, on His sinlessness, and His love for sinners. He pursues His solitary path, and strengthens us by what He endures. (iii) The "essential" is more secret and sacred than the "accidental," what comes from within than

* Dr. Thomas Chalmers is right in his quotation from Dr. Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, though wrong in his statement that it was suppressed in all editions following the first (*Bridgewater Treatise*, pp. 431–2). It was suppressed indeed, but in neither the second nor the third edition, which is the one I use. Wrong, too, is the statement that it was David Hume's influence with Adam Smith that caused its suppression. "Man conceives," said Smith, "how easily the numberless violations of duty of which he has been guilty should render him to Deity the proper object of aversion and punishment; neither can he see any reason why the Divine indignation should not be let loose, without any restraint, upon so vile an insect as he is sensible that he himself must appear to be. If he would still hope for happiness, he is conscious that he cannot demand it from the justice, but he must entreat it from the mercy of God. Repentance, sorrow, humiliation, contrition at the thought of his past misconduct, are upon this account the sentiments which become him, and seem to be the only means which he has left for appeasing wrath which he knows he has justly provoked. He even distrusts the efficacy of all these, and naturally fears lest the wisdom of God should not, like the weakness of man, be prevailed upon to spare the crime by the most importunate lamentations of the criminal. Some other intercession, some other sacrifice, some other atonement, he imagines must be made for him, beyond what he himself is capable of making, before the purity of the Divine justice can be reconciled to his manifold offences. The doctrines of revelation coincide in every respect with the original anticipations of nature; and as they teach us how little we can depend upon the imperfection of our own virtue, so they show us at the same time that the most powerful intercession has been made, and that the most dreadful atonement has been paid, for our manifold transgressions and iniquities." In order really to appreciate the above we must recollect that to Adam Smith the fundamental "moral sentiment," which is the parent of all moral action, is sympathy; and sympathy, with him, means the feeling which so identifies the person who feels with the actor and his action, and those on whom it terminates, as to share all its moral consequences.

what comes from without, because connected with higher mysteries of being; it incorporates the ideas which may be termed the factors of the person and personality of Jesus. In history Jesus is a Jew in whom the religion of Israel relives and is personalized. (iv) He so repeated and reproduced the stages in the history of His people that the very gospels themselves can be read as if He were but a reflection of events in Judaism. Thus in the first gospel Jesus embodied "law and prophecy," and He lives a life which can best be explained through the joint action of these two forces upon His people His history is conceived as the fulfilment of both law and prophecy: and His genealogy starts with Abraham, as if Jesus had no other end in life than to continue his seed and its history. In the second gospel He touches man and men touch Him, all the more that He comes to found a kingdom of grace and truth; and it may be said to represent the method of Jesus, first in making disciples, next in founding His kingdom. The third gospel is like the first, though with this difference, that Jesus is conceived as man and not simply as a Jew. Hence its purpose is to describe His manhood as a factor in the life of the race — through Him man as a race attains unity. Hence the Lucan genealogy of Jesus runs back to Adam, and terminates in a Man called the "Son of God." The fourth gospel shows how the personality of God and man have been realized in Christ, and that men must in order to be men, conceive God as He is. (v) While the third gospel is more biographical — at least in the sense that its history is needed to explain Paul's conversion and his consequent thought — and so more Pauline than the fourth, the fourth is more theological than the third, and states more distinctly what Paul conceived Christ to be. Paul makes John possible, especially in the sense that without him John could not have written, though with him

John could not but write. (vi) If we may draw out and emphasize a latent distinction, we may say, it is less with Jesus than with Christ that Paul is here placed in contrast. The Christ is indeed Paul's own creation, and we are so accustomed to think of Him in terms which we owe to Paul, that it is not possible to conceive Jesus without also conceiving the Christ. (vii) Paul is described by a famous divine of the Roman church as "a saint if ever there was one." While that church has canonized persons of more dubious character, it has never canonized a person of cleaner morals or manlier manners. He may, indeed, be described as a saint without tenderness, a marble stoic, a man without a tear; yet without him we should not have had, what may be termed, using a favourite Pauline axiom, the religion of grace. For without love no religion can be understood. To say so much is to say that the human soul is bound to endure the last loss, and be "accursed from Christ" if only man can be saved.

II

1. In explaining Paul we may follow one of two methods, and look either at the apostle through the man, or the man through the apostle. The danger of the one method is rationalism, of the other supernaturalism. As extremes are evil, we shall follow neither method; but study the man in a way we may term literary, where Paul is conceived as he is represented in his own epistles. We do not regard him as either an accident or a special creation of Deity. He belongs to the order we know; nature would not have been complete without him, nor could he have been without nature. The mind he possessed made him the apostle he became; the faith he preached

embodied his ideas. He translated the religion of Jesus, which was personal, into the religion of Christ, which was universal. He is to us, then, a man who has heard the call of God; and His call can assume many forms. It may come through a man and be sealed by a council, or may be incarnated in a vision which no one can see save him whose vision it is, or in a voice which can be heard by no other ear than by an ear attuned and listening; but however it may come, the one thing essential is: — it descends from God. Because of its origin or source, it has an authority so sovereign and ultimate that neither man nor council can cancel it. Its effect is to make the new man equal to work the old man never could have performed. It coördinates energies that had, by contending against each other, paralyzed his strength. Where God has once spoken He can again speak; where He has been welcomed He neither ceases to visit or to grow weary. The call is no miracle; it happens in conformity with the personal capacity of the man; his social environment and history are its antecedents. It comes, not like a flash out of a cloudless heaven; but is rather like the creative word, which was never so natural as when it took shape in plants and animals and men, bidding each be and bear fruit after its kind.

2. Paul's conversion and apostleship were neither arbitrary nor accidents which happened through the action of God; the visions which came to him he had the imagination to see, the mind to understand, and the clear conscience to enforce. There may seem an infinite and quite impassable distance between the young man who watched the stoning of Stephen, and guarded the clothes of them who did the deed, and the grave preacher who heard in the Macedonian man's cry the voice of Europe call to him. But the gulf which yawns between the two men is not so wide as it seems; for

they are more like than unlike. The man has throughout an open ear, and he has the will to obey. Out of sincerity a saint may be made;* out of insincerity the only creature possible is a devil.

3. Our discussions assume simply three things: (i) the world around the man, (ii) the man within the world, and (iii) the nature he received. God makes great personalities, and the personalities He makes make history. Without them history would be but a stagnant pool, which never knew living water — either movement towards good, or any good to move towards. A great people may have strong and noble impulses, but unimpersonated impulses, which means impulses unincorporated, speedily die out and ignobly perish. Thus without the Homeric genius the sporadic and limping ballads of the Greek peoples would not have been woven into the epic, with its march as of the inexorable tramp of many thousand feet; and unless they had broken into its resonant measures, they would have either died with the people who made them, or survived in the dried soul of the pedant or for the curious lore of the antiquary. Man without imagination may know the past without knowing men, and so nothing would more surprise him than a hint that they had ever lived. The tales of mean hate and impetuous love which *dilettanti* wrote either to break the fevered monotony or charm away the fancied cares which made life an intolerable burden to idle and languishing Italian dames,

* The author of the Acts makes Paul confess and attest two things:— (i.) That he had lived before God "in all good conscience" (xxiii. 1), which is, as he himself says, "to have a conscience void of offence" toward God and toward man (xxiv. 16). (ii.) As he had lived before God, he had lived before men, and the men he had lived before were too honest to condemn their brother. The author of the Acts is entirely faithful to what Paul writes concerning himself. Cf. Rom. ix. 1; xiv. 14; 1 Cor. x. 29–31; 1 Thess. ii. 20; v. 9; Gal. i. 13, 14.

would not, without the genius of Shakespeare, have become, in our English speech, tragedies which hold our very reason in awe. Without great men, then, the ideas which shape and govern man are, as unimpersonated, impotent and incapable of change into realities which all men may know. And so we argue that the hero is not created by any process possible to man, but directly by God, especially if He be conceived as the Teacher of man by making heroes, who cannot be better defined than as workers together with Him. These heroes, then, are great personalities who are allowed to help in evolving out of the potentiality, which is the Creator's work, the living actuality which is the man's. This change is worked by the action of two mysterious forces, which are both created of God, though operated by men, which forces we name, respectively, (i) descent and (ii) environment. Descent represents the action of God in time; environment the action of God in space. Behind the great men, running back through centuries of forgotten sorrows, unrecorded disciplines, abortive achievements, are the generations of their unremembered ancestors. Round the great men is a society or medium in which the latent potency they are born with may be developed into the power they are intended to become. Now these two forces each had a part in the being of Paul. He was a Jew, which is equal to his descent; he was born in Tarsus, which is simply his environment.

4. There is the place, which appealed less to the Jew in Paul than to the man. Tarsus created an appreciation of manhood which lifted him above the prejudices of race. It was a city historical and famous, old yet young, like other Greek cities at once intellectual and mercantile. It had varied ambitions, and wished to emulate in its schools the fame of Athens; and so founded

academies where art and poetry and philosophy and athletics were cultivated, as well as whatever promised to train the mind or exercise the body. In commerce Tarsus desired to rival Alexandria; and endeavoured to accumulate riches by sending the wares of the East into the marts of the West. But while the city as regards population was Greek, it had also been conquered by Rome; and so its citizens belonged to the mightiest empire on the face of the earth. Its courts, where Roman law reigned, were jealous of their decisions, for the law there administered was proud enough to distinguish between Roman and provincial; but the men who inhabited the provinces were all alike subjects of Rome, which was too proud to establish differences amongst provincials. Beside the Greek, and under the Roman, lived the Semite; and though the Semitic men were numerous, yet the speech of the city was not theirs. The man who was a Semite had a long memory, an ancient ancestry, equal pride of birth and blood to either Greek or Roman.

III

1. And this city was the birthplace of Paul. He is the only writer in the New Testament of whom we can say with certainty that he was born, bred, and educated in a city full of Greek men, yet under the law of Rome. This alone would make him unlike Jesus, who, though He is simply reported, and has written no word, yet is betrayed by His speech as a man born in a land of villages rather than cities, and who speaks to rustics in rustic speech. There is nothing in the Pauline letters so full of majesty and the sense of harmony which lives in nature as the famous comparison of the lilies of the field, which grow with-

out care, toil not and do not spin, to Solomon in all his glory who was yet not arrayed with such pomp and seemliness.*

(i) Paul, indeed, while he speaks neither of the sparrow on the housetop,† nor of the will of the Father who counts the very hairs of our head,‡ views life in the way that becomes a city-born man. Jesus feels the potency of the individual, Paul his impotence. The philosophy of history, if we may so speak, we owe to the one is a philosophy based on the eminence of the individual; but the system we owe to the other is a philosophy based on human impotence, or the potent man as but one in a multitude. Men, as a rule, are formed and fashioned as the city knows them. In other words, Christ's notion of man is the countryman's notion; but Paul's notion is the city's, which conceives man as a mere atom, and as an atom without power to mend things. (ii) While Jesus sees men standing in the market-place,§ seeking work,‖ and speaking of the sky and the weather of to-morrow,¶ or the children playing in the streets at being men,** it is the cattle, whether in the field or in literature, which attract Paul,†† who knows that they are heavy-laden beasts, and bear burdens heavier than they ought.‡‡ (iii) Jesus makes us feel that land and sea alike are bright with Divine love; but Paul that he has never seen the land lying radiant

* Matt. vi. 28, 29; Luke xii. 27.

† Psalm lii. 11; and cf. 1 Sam. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11; Matt. x. 29–32; Luke xii. 6, 7.

‡ Matt. x. 30; Luke xii. 1–24; xxi. 18.

§ Matt. xx. 3. ‖ Matt. xx. 4–7.

¶ Luke xvii. 20; xi. 29, 30; xii. 39; xxi. 7; Matt. xii. 39; xvi. 1–4.

** Matt. xi. 16; Luke vii. 32.

†† The ox was always a favoured subject with the Mosaic law; cf. Ex. xxi. 28; xxii. 1; Lev. xvii. 3. Paul refers to the "ox which treadeth out the corn," 1 Cor. ix. 9; 1 Tim. v. 18; cf. Deut. xxv. 4.

‡‡ For God's care for "cattle," see Ex. ix. 3–4, 6–7; x. 26; Jonah iv. 11; Ps. l. 10; xxxvi. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 7–10.

in the sunlight, or the beautiful green of the fields, and has not heard the waves break into their multitudinous laughter. Jesus says that seed must die in the soil in order to be a symbol of the resurrection;* but while Paul uses the same figure, it is to him literary, studied in books, never from observation. Jesus sees man in the concrete, pities, loves, redeems him; but Paul thinks of man in the abstract, as a being who, in creation's distress, turns his expectant gaze towards the unveiling of "the sons of God."† (iv) Paul's imagery, so far as it reflects his own experience, is taken from the city, and speaks of houses as the city knows them, of palaces that are gay with gold and silver, or of the workman's cottage which stands built of wood and thatched with hay or straw;‡ and of the mother who feeds the child, especially with milk, which is the food of the babe;§ of the earthenware vessel on the hearth, the mirror on the wall, the platter on the table.|| He knows the tutor who leads his pupils to school past the rows of busy shops, or through streets where in glory the triumphal procession makes its way.¶ (v) His images reflect the life of the soldier, with which every ancient city, especially so far as it was Roman, was familiar — the trumpets that are blown,** the accoutrements and arms with which the man is equipped,†† and the money he receives from an impecunious treasury. (vi) And he also, as becomes a man trained in a city devoted to the study of Roman law, speaks a legal language,‡‡

* John xii. 24. Jesus, over and above this reference, has six allusions to wheat or sifted corn; and these show how He has observed the whole process of sowing. Paul has not one; 1 Cor. xv. 36–38 is only a literary reference.

† Luke xvii. 33; Rom. viii. 19.

‡ 1 Cor. iii. 12–13.

§ 1 Cor. iii. 1–2.

|| 1 Cor. xiii. 11–13; 2 Cor. iii. 18.

¶ Gal. iii. 24–25.

** 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16.

†† Ephes. vi. 11–17.

‡‡ Rom. viii. 15–17; Gal. iv. 1–3.

and shows himself the son of a father who was a Roman citizen and who transmitted his status to his son. (vii) He speaks also concerning the theatre and amphitheatre and the race-course in terms which were natural to him, as a civilian, as the country to Jesus; his images are all urban and unlike those suggested by the rural life of man.

2. But Paul was a Jew, and of all men in the ancient world the Jew was the most devoted to his home, and the most tenacious of his distinctive character and religion.* He then was born of this race, and grew as a child amid surroundings that tended to deepen the affection for the tribe. We can imagine him carried to the synagogue as a child and taken to it as a boy, where he heard the law recited, the Psalms chanted, the history of his race narrated and explained.† He thus came to know himself as a member of a people God had chosen,‡ though man despised.§ And Paul had to mix with boys who were of his own age, though of another race; and he mixed with them as one who, though despised, may not despise again. He witnessed with pleased approval the religious processions which expressed the Greek sense of the fit and the beautiful; but Greek religion he could not think of otherwise than with

* We can estimate the devotion of the Jew to his home by the place he assigned to woman. When the Old Testament is ransacked for hints of prehistoric marriage customs, there is a danger that its actual doctrine may be lost. The place and will of the woman is recognized in the narrative of Isaac's marriage. Gen. xxiv. The place of woman is also illustrated by the position of Sarah in Abraham's household. The ideal which determined the reality was stated in Gen. ii. 20–25; on this was based the command of God, Ex. xx. 12, 14, 17; Deut. v. 16, 21; Joshua ii. 24; and such stories and statements as Judges iv. 4 ff.; Prov. xi. 16; xii. 4; xiv. 1; Mal. ii. 14; Josephus, *Antiq.*, xii. 4, 6. Paul himself agrees in 1 Cor. vii. 3, 14; xi. 3–6; Eph. v. 22–25, 28–31; Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 18, 19.

† Philo, vol. ii., pp. 327, 328.

‡ 1 Cor. i. 23–29; Gal. ii. 15.

§ Rom. ix. 28, 29; xi. 2, 3, 25, 26.

scorn. He learned to admire their art, without admiring their religion. Round him may have lived men who spoke rapturously of the Zeus of Phidias, or of gods this and that man had made, carving them out of cold marble; but the God he believed in was one who lived and reigned. He saw with the delight of a boy the Greeks playing in their games; but their love of bodily exercise he held in high disdain. He listened to the literature they liked to quote and the lines they loved to recite; but he thought of the Scriptures which his own people possessed and knew, the Psalms which they sang in praise of their God, the prophetic words which they recited when their faith was low, or the histories which described the actions of Deity in terms that were felt as a sacrament. He heard the philosophers discourse of wisdom, of truth and the search for it; and he remembered the perfect wisdom his people conceived as the fear of the Lord.

3. The chief men of the city boasted an ancient ancestry, but his descent was more venerable and illustrious than even theirs, for had not his people been old when Greeks and Romans alike were still young? The great empires of the world, whose fame was in every mouth — Egypt with her hoary civilization commemorated in the pyramids and temples, in her habitations of the dead and of deity, her mysterious wisdom, her religion, so outwardly coarse but inwardly so refined; Assyria with her winged bulls and fallen palaces, and once extensive rule, which had made her an abiding name; Persia with her vast armies, ambitious and wasteful kings, who came so near being pious, yet so fatally missed piety; Greece with her everlasting childhood and speculative wisdom, and philosophy which was the mark of manhood, and literature which ever since has been classical and will be classical as long as time endures;

Rome with her invincible legions and her imperial law, on which was engraven equally her love of conquest and of men — what were they, one and all, but moments in the being of the Eternal, allowed to be by God for ends which were His and not theirs? Paul, therefore, met the pride of the Greek with a greater pride; he confronted their beautiful real in the strength of a more splendid ideal. For their pride was the vanity that sought dignity through dress, forgetful that a beggar does not cease to be a mendicant though clothed in the crimson robes of a king; but his was the pride that sought dignity in mind, and could see it reign as a king though clothed in rags. And so he looked at the city — its art, its culture, its fashion, and its religion — and he said: "These things shall perish all, but the city and law of our God shall stand for ever."

4. The lad was miserable enough, but in due season deliverance promised to come; the hour approached when he was to go up to Jerusalem, and study the law of his God in the schools of the great masters. It was a moment when he could realize the dream which had touched with beauty both his sleeping and his waking hours; and became so blissful that time was filled with a poetry which redeemed earth from all its prose. If we have known what it is to live with no other society than philistines, — men that seem to us hard and uncongenial, because unable to comprehend the ideas we most cherish, and because they cannot but regard with hatred what they fail to understand — we can imagine the joy of escaping out of hands so unconsciously cruel into the hands of men who know and love the ideals that are our life. If we have never experienced these things, yet have imagination enough to represent their action in the soul — then we may know something of the feelings that inspired Paul when the hour came that he should go up

to Jerusalem, and with the hour came the summons which called him. She was to him Zion;* on the law of God the people meditated day and night.† Into her the men who defiled and made a lie were not permitted to enter;‡ the redeemed of the Lord lived there,§ and there the invisible presence was so the sun that illumined and warmed the city as to make the citizens feel as if they walked in a perpetual day, while the unhappy heathen slumbered in what was believed to be the outer darkness.||

IV

1. But if the joy of deliverance exceeds all joys, the pain of disillusionment is the most bitter of all miseries. And disillusionment was to be the fate of Paul. Residence in a pagan city had vexed the soul of the boy; but the stay in the "holy city" brought a deeper trouble into the conscience of the youth. The Roman was there; his soldiers walked the sacred streets and guarded the city gates; his judges administered justice, and his procurator governed in Cæsar's name the temple which was God's. And the place he ruled he had corrupted with a corruption that reached to the ministers of religion. The priests had become masters of statecraft, balancing themselves uneasily between forces that ever threatened to collide, between a sullen and obdurate people possessed of impossible ideals, and a jealous empire resentful of insults, an empire which had conquered and meant to rule. Even the man who sat in Moses' seat, the guardian and interpreter of his law, the guide and instructor of the people, had fallen from his proud preëmi-

* Isaiah lii. 1, 2, 7; lix. 20; xlviii. 2.
† Ps. i. 2; lxiii. 6; cxix. 48, 78, 148.
‡ Rev. xxi. 27.
§ Isa. lii. 9.
|| Rev. xxi. 2–4; xxii. 3–15.

nence and become a mere waiter upon events, a man on the outlook for any sign by which Providence might indicate the way in which the people should go.

2. And just as the youth reached the city an event was happening which was destined to make every man and sect appear in his and its true colours. High discussions went on daily concerning the character and mission of one called Jesus of Nazareth. Some affirmed and others denied that He was the Messiah; some testified that He had claimed to be the Son of God; others that He had said He would destroy the temple; others that He had done many mighty works; and all, that the people believed in Him, and expected Him to do great things. They were prepared to follow wherever He might lead. Consternation reigned; the priests feared collision with the Roman soldiers; the Pharisees were in terror lest their doctrines and their influence should alike suffer; while jealous Rome watched all, and held her legions in reserve. The high-priest proved himself a man of resource and action; for he so sacrificed Jesus to Rome as to save his own order and the people. The Pharisee showed himself a slave of theory and the school; for he could not ask Rome to act without recognizing her right of action, which would have been a denial of his theocratic belief and messianic hope. So the priest and the Roman crucified Jesus, while the Pharisee looked on in isolated yet approving disdain. But His death raised new problems, which, as more puzzling than those connected with His life, divided the sects the more and perplexed Paul. For rumour, selecting a point where the difference between the Jewish sects was both pronounced and keen, began to tell that Jesus had risen from the dead; His disciples said He had; the priests said He had not; the Pharisees, here again enslaved by

theory, hesitated, would have doubted, and even denied had they dared. The priests, who were Sadducees, said: "There is no resurrection";* therefore "for a dead man to rise again would be a violation of the laws of nature; but these laws, which are God's, cannot be broken, since the Creator Himself shows them the respect of obedience." But the Pharisees, who affirmed the opposite, could only say: "Whether this man has risen from the dead or not, we cannot tell; the question is one of evidence, which must be proven before an assembly of reasonable men before any faith can be demanded of us." Gamaliel, who represents this attitude of mind,† said: "Leave those men alone; if their work be of man it will be overthrown; but if their testimony is of God no man will be able to overthrow it." God was to be left to prove the event true or false, while the men whose function and duty it was to seek and find the truth quietly waited and watched whither Deity was to lead.

3. This attitude was peculiarly distasteful to the young scholar; for he was a man of inexorable reason, who hated to do anything by degrees, particularly in the region of the mind, where he believed in being thorough. He was by training and conviction a Pharisee, but this attitude of mind which the Pharisees of Jerusalem cultivated his soul abhorred. He had come from Tarsus, where the Jew was hated and his religion despised, to a city which loved the race and admired the religion, that he might study the law of his God. But under the man at whose feet he had come to sit mutiny had ripened, and finally rebellion had broken out. Moses was being smitten in his own house; his law unenforced seemed virtually repealed; the customs he had

* Acts v. 17; xxiii. 6–8; Josephus, *Antiq.*, xiii. 5–9, 10, 5–6.
† Acts v. 34–39.

established or sanctioned were neglected, and the head of Paul's school and of the Pharisees was saying: "This is God's affair; let us leave it all to Him." Two countrymen of mine once issued from a scene which had not been governed by sweet reasonableness, and the one said to the other: "This is a mad world; God mend all." "Nay, sir," came the response, "we maun help Him to mend it." Gamaliel's policy was: "Let God mend all, the whole world as well as what it contains." But our formula ought to be, as was Paul's: "We must help Him to mend it."

4. But how was he to help? His own sect stood aside, watching in masterless inactivity; their ancient enemies, the priests, seemed to be in earnest, and at least knew their own minds. In theory Paul agreed with the Pharisees, but in fact he worked with the priests. He believed in the resurrection — in the abstract; but in the concrete he did not believe that Jesus had risen. And did not this mean that Moses was superseded? And for such a supersession were he and Judaism prepared? And how was the belief in Christ's resurrection to be suppressed save by the suppression of His people? And how could they be suppressed otherwise than as He had been, by death and the cross? We think tolerance reasonable, and so it is to men with English history and Christian beliefs. But there is a mood of mind to which tolerance seems base treason; and to it correspond the two ideas — (i) that religion is a statutory law which no man can be allowed to violate at his pleasure, and that (ii) it assumes a political body created expressly for its use, and identical with the State. The idea need not be ignoble, for the man who can kill for his faith is near akin to the man who can die for it; and it is from men who have killed that we have learned the nobler duty of living and letting live.

This, then, was Paul's idea as he faced what he conceived as the great apostasy from Judaism, and he thought the one thing faith demanded of him was to arise and kill. But the man of integrity is also a man of open mind, for there is no person so incapable of conversion as the man without convictions; no man is ever in a more hopeful mood than he who possesses the consciousness of veracity and does not doubt another man's.

5. So our hero went in among the Christians to persecute, but stayed to learn. To keep the clothes of the men who stoned Stephen was to hear Stephen's words, and they were words certain to illuminate a man who saw in Israel only a form for Providence. But more illuminative than the words of Stephen was the man's own experience, which, like a mirror whose veracity he could not question, showed him the motives that moved him, the ends he pursued, and the self who pursued the ends. And he saw all as they must seem to the eye of God. In a man's deeds his thoughts are incarnated and, as it were, objectified for his own inspection and knowledge; and when Paul contrasted his own incorporated faith with the faith of the men and women he haled to prison, a suspicion as to the truth of his beliefs and the piety of his mood and the purity of his motives began to possess his mind. And it was only natural that the more he suspected himself he should the more persecute, until his zeal against the Christians became zeal against the thoughts that were rising within him. This inner conflict soon made Jerusalem intolerable to him, for he could not live there and cease from persecuting; and to persecute became daily less and less possible, especially to persecute those whose faith at once quickened his doubts and reproached his unbelief. Hence feeling as if he might by changing the scene avert the impending change and

continue his deadly policy, he went to the high-priest, begged letters for Damascus, and took the way thither. But on the way the vision he had been seeking to escape from came; he saw, "as one born out of due time," the Lord, and found He was one with the Jesus he had persecuted. The vision was a call, and the call was God's tribute to the man's integrity, to the good, though ill-informed, conscience in which he had lived. There are men who, in the manner of all superior persons, persecute religion by professing to tolerate it. But there is nothing so blind as intellectual vanity, and to it no vision is ever granted. We have all at one time or another taken the way to Damascus, fleeing from the conviction we fear and wish to avoid; but the fear may be illusory. The vision comes to none but the man of sincerity all compact, seeking the light he loves that he may do the will of God, though it may be a will he does not love.

V

The vision may be named the experience which made Paul a Christian apostle. But he was altogether too resolute a man to be satisfied with an approximation to the perfect. His preparation, which was at the same time a probation, was still incomplete, and without its completion no ministry could be named apostolic.

1. He retreats into Arabia; he seeks solitude in the desert, where he can be silent and think. The vision has made him a new creature; without the old things are passed away, within all things have become new; and so the changed man does not at once understand the changed universe into which he is born. The heart within must be wedded to the nature without, and before he can see truly his eyes must be accustomed to the new light; for if the eyes fail to see the

truth, how can the tongue describe it? It is said that in every young Melanchthon there is an old Adam, and the old Adam is never so potent or so cunning as when he induces the young Melanchthon to express himself concerning the mysteries of faith in premature and presumptuous speech, which is ever both flippant and impertinent. The man who has been found of God will live with sealed lips until he knows something of the God who has found him. To go into silence, to wait till God penetrates the conscience and illumines the soul that the man may become luminous through and through, is our part in the economy of grace, and a sure sign that God intends truth to break into the world through us. So Paul is called to an apostleship, and must understand alike what the call and what the apostleship signify. We appreciate the man's homage to the truth and what it means; to the God who has called and led him; and what is the message he will yet have to deliver. We read the more carefully, we listen the more attentively to the man's voice in his epistles that we know he does not speak without thought, or till he has sojourned for years in the Arabian deserts.

2. The solitude, which is at once preparation and probation, has a second stage, which shows the need and the wisdom of silence. He goes up to Jerusalem as a man who has seen God face to face, has heard His voice, and studied His speech till he has mastered its very accents. He has also looked at nature, at man, and at history, as well as at himself and his mission through the truth he has received; but what does he find without him and around him when "he essayed to join himself to the disciples"? Suspicion. "All were afraid of him, and did not believe that he was a disciple."* In the apostolic church, and, indeed, in the

* Acts ix. 26.

apostolic men, there was much of the very common and frail humanity we know so well, which finds it so easy to believe in the conventional, to doubt what transcends it, to walk according to custom, to think that what fashion has not sanctioned God does not approve. Hence when Paul came to Jerusalem the men who were "reputed to be pillars"* said: "The young man, though his bodily presence is weak, is no doubt both earnest and eloquent; his intellect is strong; his way of putting things is not ours, but is unusual and even audacious; but he cannot have authority in the church unless he be our delegate. Let him tarry awhile till his beard grows; once his docility is proved, we shall consider his case again and deliver our judgment." Each age has its own trials, but possibly the hardest to bear is the disillusionment which overtakes the sanguine and the susceptible when contact with the real fractures the ideal. And of all disillusionments the sorest is the discovery that those we had esteemed as saints are mere mortal men, stained and flawed even as we are. And here, though the young disciple was disillusioned, yet he was not discouraged. He who had stoned men because they disagreed with him was now ready to be stoned himself by those with whom he did not agree. He now saw what he was once too blind to see, that it was more blessed to be a martyr than to inflict martyrdom, — the faith he was glad to be judged worthy to illustrate. He had in Arabia so lived alone with God and His truth that he now measured man by the truth, not the truth by man; he so loved the truth as not to hate the men who loved it as well as he did, though, not having lived as long as he in the Arabian desert, they understood it less. The feeble in mind or in conviction may lose faith in God because bad men live around them;

* Gal. ii. 9.

but a brave — which here means a good — man who has been charged with the conversion of the world will not falter when he finds that there are men in the church who need to be converted as much as if they lived in the world. So, though not Jewish enough to please the men "reputed to be somewhat,"* Paul turned to dispute against "the Hellenists," or Grecian Jews, men who were by birth and training like himself.† Hence came trouble, for "they went about to kill him"; and so "the brethren," who were all conventional men and desired quiet rather than controversy, "brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus."‡

3. And so the man came back to the city where he had lived as a boy, and looked with new eyes and a changed and chastened spirit at the men around him and at the problems they suggested. He had not lost his idealism because his older ideals had perished; on the contrary, larger and sublimer dreams had taken their place. He had ceased to be a Jew only and had become a man, a member of the human race; and the God he believed in did not belong to the Hebrews, but to all mankind.§ And so there came to him a change of feeling towards man. He did not think of him as hating God, but as feeling after that he might find Him.‖ As he confronted the Greek, and was himself a "Hebrew of the Hebrews,"¶ his intellectual vision was enlarged, and he saw truth as it lived in the mind of God, though with the eye of one who loved mankind. As

* Gal. ii. 6.

† Acts ix. 29. What the Hellenists, or Grecian Jews, were we know from Acts vi. 1. Stephen was one of them, vi. 5; the qualities that make him a forerunner of Paul are indicated, vi. 8, and had to do with his death, vi. 9–14. He may have been born in the same city as Paul, vi. 9; their connection is evident, vii. 58; viii. 1.

‡ ix. 30.

§ Rom. iii. 29, 30.

‖ Acts xvii. 27.

¶ Phil. iii. 5.

he faced the Roman state, in the place where he had been free-born,* there rose before his imagination the ideal of an eternal city whose citizens were of the household of God.† Hence the enforced silence in Tarsus was even more educative than the solitude of Arabia had been, or the society that in Jerusalem surrounded the apostolic men and constituted the local church. For one thing, the silence was friendly to thought. In Arabia he was alone with God, in Jerusalem he was entangled in the controversies touching the old law and the new; but in Tarsus he could think of God and man together, of man in search of God, and of God as without respect of persons or races, accepting man.‡ If he had remained in the desert he might have sunk into an impotent anchorite; if he had continued in Jerusalem he might have declined into a pro-Judaic or an anti-Judaic rabbi, polemical through and through, in spirit as well as in speech. But in Tarsus he won another temper, and achieved the mind that made him the apostle of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles.

For Tarsus suggested new thoughts to the mind of Paul. We know enough of the place to understand its fascination for him. In Tarsus there were Greeks, Romans, and various Semitic peoples, including Jews; its population was not simply mixed, but every class had its own religious ideas and home. The ideas were worthy of a city of mixed inhabitants. It is not a modern discovery that churches are improved by people being able to compare the more with the less noble; but is as ancient as religion. So Tarsus felt, with this difference between the ancient and the modern point of view, that there was no rivalry between religions any more than there was between class and class, or citizen and citizen. They were ranged according to descent, as dis-

* Acts xxii. 28. † Eph. ii. 19. ‡ Rom. ii. 11.

tinct and different, not as contrary and opposed. Paul, therefore, in the discourses at Lystra,* and on Mars Hill,† and in the Epistle to the Romans,‡ gives an account of religious ideas which sprang directly out of what he had experienced as a citizen of Tarsus. What was needed, therefore, was to set in motion his thought, applying it to the complex phenomena directly suggested by Tarsus.

4. And the occasion which called Paul to a nobler and more characteristic ministry came not as before, in a vision, but in and through a person. Barnabas, which seems to have been his Christian name, and had quite superseded his racial name of Joseph, was a Levite, a native of Cyprus, and a Jew by descent.§ He was, therefore, a Hellenist, born, like Paul himself, outside the Holy Land; and like him, therefore, a Grecian Jew, though richer than he,|| and descended from Hebrew parents, priestly by family. He was a rare and beautiful character, "a good man, full of the Holy Ghost,"¶ possessed of many gentle, gracious, and brotherly qualities. He seems to have occupied but a minor place in the early church, yet he did a greater thing than any of the original apostles — he discovered Paul. The man who knows a hero is second only to the hero he knows. He can discern spirits; secrets that lie latent in a silent man become patent to him. This gift of discernment Barnabas possessed, but in his case its value was enhanced by the presence of even rarer quali-

* Acts xiv. 14–17. † Acts xvii. 22–31. ‡ ii. 12–16.

§ Acts iv. 36, 37. There are many alternative explanations suggested by Klostermann, Dalman, Deissmann, and Nestle, but Luke's derivation seems adequate and satisfactory, especially if the phrase be rendered as "Son of exhortation." "Exhortation" was indeed a function of the prophet and the preacher. Acts xiii. 15; xv. 31; Rom. xii. 6–8; xv. 4–5; 1 Cor. xiv. 3; 2 Cor. viii. 4, 17. Of the thirty references in the New Testament to παράκλησις all but three, which stand in Hebrews, occur in Paul and Luke. || iv. 37. ¶ Acts xi. 24.

ties. He had, if one may so speak, the meekness that had characterized Moses; no jealousy of the meaner sort troubled his spirit. He saw and appreciated the strong man, and was happy if only he could provide him with the opportunity his ability deserved. He would, indeed, have been pleased had he been able to perform the work that was natural to Paul; but he had the same feeling of self-abnegation which induced the Baptist to say as he regarded Christ: "He must increase, but I must decrease."*

Behind his spirit lay also the faith that made the strength of behaviour, the conviction that Paul had in him the making of an apostle. This was the secret of his conduct at Jerusalem, where, when he saw the disciples stand aloof from Paul, he brought him to the apostles, and made himself sponsor for the qualities that distinguished the man who was yet to be the apostle to the Gentiles.† But the apostles had little faith in human nature, especially if it differed from their own. And so Barnabas was sent by the Church at Jerusalem to work in Antioch.‡ He obeyed, but soon found the work too arduous for his strength. Then Paul rose before the memory and the imagination of Barnabas, and we read that "he went forth to Tarsus to seek for Saul, and when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch."§

VI

1. But the Paul he found was different from the Paul he had met at Jerusalem. The man had suffered from men, and had learned by what he had suffered. He was changed, yet the same man. His experience had been twofold, (i) at Jerusalem, and (ii) at Tarsus. (i) At Jerusalem he had

* John iii. 30.
† Acts ix. 27.
‡ xi. 22.
§ xi. 25, 26.

suffered a double disillusionment: — had seen by the help of the Jews through Judaism; and by the help of the Christians he had learned to know the possibilities of Christianity. He saw that Judaism could not be extended so as to embrace the Gentile; but what was impossible to it was possible to Christianity, which had in it the making of a universal religion. (ii) In Tarsus he had been welcomed by those he had once shunned, and had seen the best side of Hellenic and Roman religion, and had also seen how little it differed from the higher Semitic beliefs. He may be said to have come out from Tarsus the second time much more advanced in his theology than when he issued from it before; and he was quite prepared to learn the lesson which Antioch was both able and willing to teach. Antioch in Syria was not as in Pisidia; it was unlike in history while like in character. Both were founded by Seleucid kings, and showed in their names the influence of their founders; but the Pisidian city was Phrygian, while the Syrian was Greek. The Syrian was near the sea, but no seaport; near the desert, but no link in the caravan routes that united east and west. It was, small as its population is to-day, the third city in the Roman Empire, with the ambition to displace Alexandria, which was first in commerce as in wealth.

2. We are not, therefore, surprised to find that Paul at Antioch first turned to the Gentiles, and to come upon traces of his larger ministry.

(i) "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch."* The church had been a mere Jewish sect, not remarkable as such, with no large principle of life within it. But there it became the Christian religion incorporated in Christian men. Christ's incorporation with

* Acts xi. 26.

man became a symbol — creative, sovereign, distinctive — transforming the church into the religion of Christ. "Christian" is a hybrid word, partially Greek, partially Latin, yet expressing more than any word the idea of a religion, universal, catholic; the religion which incorporated the best elements in all the religions professed of men. As such it became broader than Judaism, and more able to be just to both God and man.

(ii) "The disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judæa."* At the same moment that man's brotherhood was born — being witnessed to by the religion with the new name — there happened a second birth — man's responsibility for man, the conviction that distance did not divide, nor race distinguish, nor blood alienate; that wealth did not isolate from poverty, nor allow poverty to die in its want, for wealth was bound out of its own abundance to supply the brother's needs. Those who remember Paul's plea for help for the "poor saints" at Jerusalem,† i.e. for the men who lacked and who needed help from those who had in abundance; or his rapturous thanks to God for "His unspeakable gift,"‡ which closes his praise of Corinthian "liberality," will not need to be told that what the people then, prophetically, realized at Antioch, was Pauline. There was, indeed, no deeper or truer idea in Paul than this: he who helped the soul must also help to clothe the body.

(iii) There is a still higher responsibility, also born in Antioch: — There was equal responsibility for the spirit and the body of men. The church had both in its charge; by following the one, its charity becomes philanthropic and as broad as man; by following the other, its love became missionary and universal. The voice of the Holy

* xi. 29. † Rom. xv. 26; Gal. ii. 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 1–3. ‡ 2 Cor. ix. 15.

Spirit said, therefore, to the church: "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them."* That work was what we know as "conversion," which is the best of all missionary enterprises. And so the church at Antioch, when it "had fasted and prayed, and laid hands upon them, sent them away."† They went, therefore, as ambassadors of the church in the city which had first given to it the name "Christian," and so had lifted Christianity above being a mere Jewish sect; yet the two friends went in a gracious companionship. Paul was the governing mind, but Barnabas had the guiding heart; and so it was but natural that they should seek first his native Cyprus,‡ and try there to win for Christ the people he first knew and loved most. Then there is the crossing to the mainland and reaching Pisidian Antioch, where Paul preached in the synagogue a sermon, which is simple, indeed, as a first effort both in structure and in plan, as in terms of thought; yet is prophetic of the epistles which were still unwritten, though later they were to be the first seeds of the New Testament, and to make the mind of Christendom. The Jews may have been jealous when Barnabas and Paul alike turned to the Gentiles. In Phrygian and Galatian cities they preached now to men so ignorant and superstitious as to imagine they were gods, and now to men so hostile as to treat them as the worst of criminals. Yet everywhere the supremacy of Paul appears; he is *the* speaker,§ the man who suffers equally from the anger and the applause of the multitude.||

(iv) To the church at Antioch, which had originally "recommended" them "to the grace of God," they returned and rehearsed all that God had done by their means, and

* Acts xiii. 2. † xiii. 3.
‡ iv. 36; xiii. 4. § Acts xiv. 12. || xiv. 11, 14, 19.

then they abode long time with the disciples.* Their success was so great that they felt they could not bind down the converts to observe Pharisaic Judaism; and so Jerusalem took alarm at the door of faith being set so wide open to the Gentiles. Hence certain men came down from Judæa and taught the brethren, "Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved."† With these men who so taught, Paul and Barnabas had, to the perplexity of the inexperienced, "no small dissension and questioning" as to the right of Jerusalem to close the door in the face of the Gentiles, by saying that none could be saved who did not keep the law of Moses. They were, therefore, sent to the church at Jerusalem to lay the matter before "the apostles and elders."‡ What these counselled and decreed we know; it is written in the Acts of the Apostles.§

3. But while the apostles and elders decreed a compromise which satisfied neither the Jews nor the people of Antioch, what Paul demanded, and his reasons for demanding it, we can find in his four great Epistles written in the early part of his career. Whether, on the one hand, circumcision be needful, or, on the other hand,|| eating with the Gentiles be necessary, is discussed once and for all in the Epistle to the Galatians.¶ The question was really very simple, whether it was necessary to become a Jew in order to be a Christian, or whether a man, without being either inwardly or outwardly a Jew, could be converted and saved. There is something most offensive to the law of caste in a common table and a common meal. The spirit of class or sect may reign, but social distinc-

* Acts xiv. 26–28. † xv. 1.

‡ Acts xv. 2. § xv. 13–22.

|| Circumcision is settled by the paimary instance of Titus (Gal. ii. 3–5).

¶ Gal. ii. 11 ff.

tions which have no religious sanction do not become inexorable social laws. The king and the noble, the peer and the commoner, the farmer and the peasant, the master and the workman, may all — and as a matter of fact do — here in England dine together; and no one feels that he has done anything that calls for praise or blame. In India to-day caste may govern in food as well as in other things, so that what a man shall eat or drink, who shall cook or purchase it, who shall be present at the eating, wait upon or serve the man, who shall eat with the eater, or even who shall see him eat, however humble his fare may be, is regulated by the law that is most Divine. In the halls of English schools and colleges men of ancient lineage, and men whose ancestors are, or were, quite unknown, men of historic name or of no name whatever, sons whose fathers are so rich that how to spend their wealth is a real anxiety, and sons of parents so poor that how they live is a wonder to all men who know — may meet together, dine together, sit at the same table, eat of the same food, without violating any religious law or principle. This unity of class, of race, of mind, comes from a unity of manhood and of religion, which recognizes the man; and is one of the many results of Paul's action at Antioch. In India men may be educated together, yet together they cannot live, for education cannot unite where religion holds asunder; and where men have no common table they can have neither common manhood nor common life.

4. As described in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, Peter, in eating with the Gentiles, simply denied the law of caste, which, as an integral part of religion, came from its being based on distinctions of speech, of colour, and of race. Hence the act was construed as equal to a denial of any preëminence, not only of Jewish blood, but

also of the efficacy and distinction of the circumcision which symbolized Jewish religion. The spirit of happy brotherhood which reigned at Antioch carried Peter off his feet; and, like the honest and impulsive man he was, "he did eat with the Gentiles." But certain hard, formal Jewish men came from James; and they so terrified Peter that all the generous impulses died within him, and "he drew back and separated" from the Gentiles. The recoil "carried away" "the rest of the Jews," and bore even Barnabas back to the old law. But Paul, who here remained immovable, stood up and rebuked Peter "to the face because he was to be blamed." It is a hard thing to withstand a brother to his face, especially when he is as open and free-handed as was Peter. It is easy, indeed, to withstand any man behind his back; that, indeed, is not to withstand, but simply to supplant. It is not to correct a friend, but to create an enemy; it is not to uphold a right, but to inflict a wrong, making apologetic or explanatory speech impossible. Paul, by his method of public reproof, made it evident that not only had he a good cause, but a cause that was so good that it was capable of being argued before all men, and so just that it had nothing to fear from Peter's reply. And the question, as he argued it, was lifted above all trivialities, whether they belonged to eating and drinking, or to circumcision. For the Pauline law had more to do with a method of saving than with any question of race; whether one is Jew or Gentile is a less question than another involved, whether works be required or faith alone be needful to the man's saving. Here we have, therefore, the distinctive Pauline gospel: Man is not justified by law, but by faith; he is saved by grace, and not by works. In salvation God is all in all; His is the mercy that pities, His is the love that redeems, His is the will that justifies. In kin or name, in birth or

blood, in civil custom or religious observance, there is no merit that can avail before God; nor is any needed, for man can now attain the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ. And hence this faith ends the reign of the sinful flesh; it is "no longer I that live, but Christ that liveth in me."* With the Christian man, made an incarnation of Christ as Christ is of God Himself, must not the eternal love which gave itself up for me live in me for the saving of the world?

* Gal. ii. 20.

VIII

PAUL IN EUROPE

I

1. PAUL returned from Jerusalem to Antioch with a clearer mind on many questions, and especially on three: (*a*) He had not been made an apostle by such persons as he had met. Peter, James, and John may have been men of reputation who were pillars in the church, yet they had neither created nor sanctioned nor sanctified his apostleship.* (*β*) He was commanded by a God he dared not disobey; and to be silent was to be disobedient.† (*γ*) The men he was to preach the Gospel to he must seek out; otherwise they would not hear what God had designed and destined for them.‡ He was free indeed to wander wherever there were men; but, according to his own custom, he could not go unaccompanied. So he proposed to his ancient comrade that they should again travel together, visit the churches where they had converts, and see how the brethren fared.§ But Barnabas declined. What his reasons were for the declinature may be conjectured rather than certainly known; and they may be represented now as those that either do or do not flatter human pride, and now as a mixture of the mean and the sublime. The reasons which flatter this pride are most in keeping with the traditional character of Barnabas, and have as their most common root a sympathy which leans to the side of the

* Gal. i. 1; ii. 6–9.
† 2 Cor. v. 11, 13–16, 18–20.
‡ Rom. x. 6–9, 13–16.
§ Acts xv. 36.

oppressed, who are as a rule weaker than their oppressor. Barnabas had friends on both sides; and he could not bear to see persons he loved differ in opinion, or to feel himself bound to go with strength while he sympathized with weakness. This feeling was intensified by a sort of parental affection he had for John Mark, "a sister's son."* This relative he had in the previous journey taken as a companion;† but the lad's heart had failed, and with it his will to serve. Paul, who admired strength, especially as seen in obedience, distrusted the fickle youth and would not have him; but Barnabas would not go without him.‡ So between the two there arose "so sharp a contention that they departed asunder, the one from the other."§

The reasons which do not flatter human pride are yet counterfeits of those that do, exhibiting a mixture of the mean and the sublime; their common root is in what may be termed "sympathy with the weak"; but it is this sympathy turned, as it were, sour through suspicion. Yet it is impossible to hold this position without adding that Barnabas' motives were more mixed than is quite compatible with his assumed simplicity of character; and that the real reason why he broke the ties which had so long and so closely bound him to Paul was rather jealous envy of strength than sympathy with weakness. This assumes that we can correctly name envy the curious amalgam of the jealousy which refuses to be patronized by a man we once were patrons of, and of the feeling of pity for the weak which feels sore with the strong.||

2. The conflict appealed to Paul as a question of belief,

* Col. iv. 10.
† Acts xv. 37.
‡ Acts xv. 38.
§ Acts xv. 39.
|| Paul may be said to have equal responsibility with Barnabas for Mark's presence in Antioch (xii. 25). He may have been a native of Jerusalem (xii. 12), and so known to the church there.

in which he became ever keener in temper and more uncompromising in judgment; but to Barnabas it seemed a difference between persons which estranged those who ought to be friends. The parting of Paul and Barnabas was all the more tragic that it was so inevitable. Paul could understand Barnabas better than Barnabas could understand Paul. Barnabas made the greater sacrifice, though possibly it cost him less to do it; but Paul performed the greater duty and suffered the acuter pain. There are men who so pity the weak as to fear to offend him, and they would govern the world according to his whim; such a man was Barnabas. But there are other men who think truth in its struggle with error in need of a man's strength, and the coward to them is simply a man who may leave a gap or create a tremor in the ranks through which the enemy may steal — Paul was one who so thought. The faint-hearted are too careless of freedom and truth to be entrusted with the work of Providence in the world; while the strong think too lightly of the weak to be left in supreme control. If we have ever for truth's sake surrendered the man we so loved as to wish to clasp him to our side with hoops of steel, we may be able to measure their sorrow. There is a place and a function in the church for both Barnabas and Paul; Paul may best be fitted to be a minister of the truth which saves the soul; but Barnabas was so built as to love the soul which the truth saves. It is, indeed, significant that when the fair and beautiful companionship which had done so much for man was sundered and broken, Barnabas disappears from history, and Paul steps upon a firmer and broader stage. Barnabas and John Mark sailed away to Cyprus,* and while "the son of exhortation"† may there

* Acts xv. 39.

† Acts iv. 36. The name is related to the προφήτης, part of whose duty was to "exhort" (xv. 32; 1 Cor. xiv. 3).

have continued trying to heal the broken in heart and to strengthen the feeble in will, yet he is seen no more. But Paul stands out more clearly as a doer of the deeds which carried in their bosom the happiness as well as the future of mankind.

3. What now marked Paul's entrance upon this new and vaster stage may be said to be his assertion of a right which no man could dispute of the apostleship to the Gentiles.* In him Christianity as a religion became conscious of its universal functions and destiny. And how shall we better describe the process which turned a natural human person into an organ and agent of the Divine Will than as a direct call of the Almighty?† This has been in its universal aspects disguised in a question which men may still think it worth their trouble to discuss: What is the supreme moment in history? Was the greatest hour when Moses fled from the Egyptians to the desert; or when the Romans gathered on the hills above the Tiber and began to build their huts of mud and clay; or when Alexander of Macedon broke out of Greece and carried the Greek tongue over the world; or when Cæsar crossed the Rubicon to change, by help of his legions, an outworn republic into a potent empire? Each of these may have its advocates; but to me the supreme event is when "Paul chose Silas," and started with him on a mission that before it was ended had converted Europe and inaugurated the reign of one religion for civilized man. The idea and its realization were Paul's, who did not, indeed, found Christianity, though he made it universal.

4. Once men wrote, as there may be men who still write, the history of Paul's enterprise somewhat thus: "An ugly little Jew, an ill-clad artisan, who earned a mean living

* Gal. ii. 9. † Gal. i. 16.

at weaving cloth for tents, — a Jew of the class more familiar with the slums and gutters of the East End than with the spacious squares and gilded palaces of our West Ends — and I so speak not because by personal experience or inspection I know anything of the East End, but because the men belong to a class which is accustomed to seek a bed on the quay and to frequent places where outcasts most do congregate — began about this time to preach what he was pleased to call *his gospel*. He gathered in the cities he visited a curious concourse of people — slaves, often runaways, who had deserted and wanted to forget the masters they once had — porters, wharfingers, tailors, cobblers, freedmen of all sorts, devout women, and women who had once been undevout — and he constituted them into societies, or guilds, which he had the audacity to name ἐκκλησίαι, just as if they had been regular assemblies of free-born or enfranchised men. A considerable measure of success attended his enterprise, for fanaticism and hypocrisy are near akin; and the fanatic never fails to find people willing to be deceived as he is prompt at deceiving. It is worthy of note that this man was a Hellenistic Jew, which means that he was even hungrier than the hungriest Greek."

II

1. But we, looking back through the centuries, with eyes they have clarified and illumined, find the real man to be quite other than our supposititious historian had imagined. We find him to have achieved the greatest work any man ever accomplished. For he is a possessed man, impelled by an idea to visit many lands and cities, preaching wher-

ever he goes to all classes and races. He chooses Silas as his companion, no untried or unworthy successor of Barnabas, but a man who had proved his fitness to accompany a missionary to mankind. By descent Silas may have been like Paul himself a Hellenist, and therefore a Jew; or like Nicolas of Antioch,* a proselyte, and therefore a Gentile. Of his descent absolutely nothing is known; and he is first met "as a chief man among the brethren" at Jerusalem.† As such he is sent with Judas, as a man trusted by "the apostles and the elders and the whole church," to accompany Paul and Barnabas; and as a chosen man he goes to tell Antioch "by word of mouth" the same things as were contained in the apostolic letter.‡ He knew the men at Jerusalem and its older traditions, but his sympathies with them were imperfect; he so believed with the freer spirits at Antioch that he, though a prophet, specially called to "exhort the brethren," abode there and did not return with Judas to the mother church.§ We can imagine something of the attraction of Silas for Paul, and of Paul for Silas; their biographies had been similar — both had been disillusioned; both, though they had lost faith in the apostles, had gained faith in Christianity as a universal religion needed of men, and so as an absolutely new thing in the world.

2. And so Paul, with Silas as his companion, leaves Antioch, journeys through Syria and Cilicia, where we may be sure he would not forget its capital, Tarsus. Together they visit Derbe and Lystra, make new converts without forgetting the old. They traverse the Phrygian and Galatic region, and thought of preaching in the province of Asia, where large cities like Ephesus and Smyrna and Pergamos stood

* Acts vi. 5. † Acts xv. 22.
‡ Acts xv. 27. § Acts xv. 34.

in their way and attracted them; but the Holy Spirit forbade. Then they looked northward to Bithynia, where were brawny and strenuous men, a race it would be well to evangelize; but thither the Spirit suffered them not to go. By Mysia they passed, and "came down to Troas"; and there, as Paul faced the sea and looked over into Europe, the things he may have learned and dreamed of at Tarsus and in Asia shaped themselves into a vision. For the point where he stood and the places he had passed through could not have been insignificant to him. Before he had reached Troas he may have caught sight of the Scamander, "yellow as a duck's foot"; while the very name of the place became prophetic of the future. Priam and his son Hector would be there, doing battle with the well-greaved Greeks who had come in their swift ships across the sea to avenge a ravished home; to demolish the stronghold which sheltered the loves and the infamies of Paris and Helen; and to accomplish deeds whose fame could be translated into a song that, like the music of Homer's own "loud-sounding sea," lives and echoes for ever. There, too, in later days, Alexander of Macedon had come, romantic and a creator of romance, yet wayward, with a sort of epic ambition seeking worlds to conquer, and finding what he sought. There, too, as the Latin poet has imagined and sung, the Romans were ere Rome was; and thence had they in the loins of Father Æneas started westward to found in a fairer land and under a happier sky the mightiest empire of time.

3. While the place around him thus spoke to his imagination, the realms behind and the cities through which he had passed had not been dumb. There, from time immemorial, East and West had met and mingled in the most diverse peoples and races and religions. The armies of Egypt had marched over the land, led by

kings who worshipped the cat or the cow, the serpent or the beetle. The sons of the mighty hunter, Nimrod, had there conquered and governed. Along the coasts Phœnician barks had traded, carrying the purple and the vices, the wares and the gods of Tyre. Moses and the Hebrews had there witnessed to God and His law, and the prophets had preached to men who did not care to hear. Persia had there taught a dualism, faith in a good and an evil deity, a seed of thought whose riper fruit a certain Augustine, like a later and more western Paul, was to pluck and taste and cast away. Hither, too, from the remoter East the Buddhist monk may have come, preaching the misery of life, the good of perfect oblivion, and the piety of asceticism. And would not a region so rich in dead gods and in decayed religions speak somewhat thus to Paul: "What wilt thou do with thy new faith? Listen to the voice of the ancient sea: 'So far mayst thou come, but no farther canst thou go; tarry here, let the faith thou bearest live and die on the soil which has been the birthplace and graveyard of so many beliefs.'"

4. But a man whose soul was, as it were, pregnant with the future could not obey the hollow voice of the dead; and so his spirit turned from the wrinkled age of Asia to the fair face of Europe, where dwelt power and perennial youth. He saw that a faith to be universal must win the mind of the world; that a religion which did not capture and control the reason could have neither divinity nor majesty for man. And that Reason which still lived and flourished in Greece, and especially in Athens, where was taught a nobler philosophy than had satisfied Tarsus, and which demanded that men should teach it, asks: "What is truth? Who will show us the living good, or bring to our knowledge a better deity than our

fathers or our schools have known?" But he also saw and knew that religion could not prosper apart from commerce; that it must go with the tradesman to his shop; with the merchant to the exchange; with the sailor in his ship, and must be carried over the whole earth amid the wares man purchases. And if religion was to be allied with commerce, must it not seek a home in cities like Corinth or Alexandria, whence it might be wafted by the winds across the Mediterranean Sea to Italy and even Rome? And the artisans who made the goods which the merchant exchanged; as well as the slaves who toiled to produce wealth for their masters, and the masters the slaves maintained in idleness, did they not need religion to ennoble their manhood and enhance their view of life? And where could men be met in greater numbers than in imperial Rome and in the maritime cities of the empire? And Rome herself, which had given man order and law, civil rights and intellectual freedom, whose legionaries and jurists, whose philosophers and poets, orators and men of letters, soldiers and civilians, generals and proconsuls, were everywhere, and wherever they were were empowered either to conquer or to govern; and was not the emperor worshipped as a god, and the city which had given her name to the empire — did not she most of all need the new religion with its gracious humanity, its beneficent yet sovereign Deity? And if this religion did not conquer the city which governed the world, how could it ever expect to convert and to hold the world which the city governed? And did not to the west and north of Italy tribes live, whether called Gauls, Britons, Germans, Helvetic or Spanish men, — who were all to be states and kingdoms when Rome had ceased to be an empire? And how could they, unhelped and unblessed by a humane religion, develop all their infinite promise? The

future of Europe lay, therefore, not in the hands of Augustus — who was to find it more easy to rebuild Rome in imperial marble rather than in republican brick, or create within her the ideals of Roman law — but in the soul of Paul as he looked from Troas across the silver strip of sea.

III

1. Whether the man of Macedonia were or were not the same person as the author of the Acts, is a question more curious than either edifying or scientific; but it is otherwise with the vision, especially when read through the saying which is its interpretation: "Come over into Macedonia and help us."* In this saying three things are emphasized: (*α*) the person who has the vision: he who hears the cry for help, and in obedience to it crosses to Europe; (*β*) the thing he was to bring, the new religion, which was to come to their help; (*γ*) the persons who needed the new religion. It is evident that of these elements the man who had the vision is the most important. Paul believed in the universal function of Christianity; and he effectively preached what he himself had discovered. The monotheism of Israel, which was the apostle's birthright and the birthright of every Jew, was the basis of what was universal in Christianity; but this monotheism was trebly modified (i) by the attribution of Fatherhood to God;† (ii) by the title, construed in an essential sense, given to the Founder of Christianity, "the Son of God";‡ and (iii) by the title He had given to Himself of "the Son of Man." §

* Acts xiv. 9.

† Matt. xi. 25; Rom. viii. 15; Col. i. 19; Heb. xii. 7–9.

‡ John i. 18, 49; iii. 16–18; v. 26; Rom. viii. 32.

§ Matt. viii. 20; ix. 6; xi. 19; Luke v. 24.

The (i) followed directly from the (ii), and the (ii) by inevitable inference from the (i), as the ultimate datum of our thinking is conceived as given either in Christian experience or in human reason. The (iii) signifies what God is in relation to man. For that One who should speak of Himself as "Son of Man" while men speak of Him as "Son of God," means the coalescence in Him of the ideas of God and man; that to be a "man" is to be nearer God and to have more of Him within than to be either Jew or Greek; that God had a scheme, which He had not for special families of men only, but for collective humanity, for he who is built into it alone reaches the Divine end of his being; that every man could be what Christ was, and each is bound to become what He was; that only those who realized the filial ideal became members of the social unity termed mankind; and that man is a Diviner name than either Jew or Greek, Gentile or Roman, for these names are but special, while "man" is generic, and denotes not only a race, but also a Divine society.

2. The "vision" expressed therefore more than the brooding habit of the Pauline mind; it expressed the idea that the thoughts which took shape in the Macedonian and his cry were born of sympathy with the purposes of God and the capabilities of man. The "vision" was, indeed, heavenly, and signified three things: (α) a call which God gave, (β) an obedience which Paul supplied, and (γ) sufferings which were furnished by the action of man. And sufferings seemed the only things which the vision invited to; Paul by stepping into Europe stepped into pain. Not that suffering was a new thing to him; he had suffered much from Jew and Gentile and Christian. He forsook the Jews' religion, but he did not cease to love the Jews. Love is a rare as well as an excellent

thing, in which the higher self achieves a victory over the lower. Paul became more Christlike as he conceived Christ to be the Son of God, Divine and yet, as ideal man, human, who loved him, lived in him, and through him loved all mankind.* He did not cease to be a convert and never either felt or acted as an apostate. An apostate is a man who changes sides without changing convictions; he does the one without doing the other, probably because he has no convictions to change. But a convert is a man who changes sides because he has changed convictions, and has found the change of convictions even harder than the change of sides. The apostate makes up for his contempt of the men he has joined by his hatred of the men he has forsaken; but the convert expresses his devotion to his new beliefs by his respect for the old. An apostate loves no one, not even himself, especially if love be a form of self-respect; a convert hates no one, least of all a brother man. An apostate is the man whose God is himself; a convert is the man so in the hands of God that, being what God means him to be, he is always humble and obedient.

3. This distinction is illuminative as well as illustrative. Paul never ceased to love the Jews; the Jews never came either to know or to love Paul. They could not feel as Browning felt to his lost leader:

> Just for a handful of silver he left us,
> Just for a ribbon to stick in his coat,

for he gained by his change neither silver, nor ribbon, nor even a coat. He chose a religion which was, historically, the successor of Judaism; but in choosing it he also chose poverty, want, oppression, pain, and the hatred of the men he had left. "If he had only remained ours," they may

* Gal. ii. 20–21.

have said, "we might have thrown off the Roman yoke, have cast away the oppressor, built up another than the rabbinical religion and reformed our faith from within." As he had gone without their leave, they followed him with their hate. There is no hate so vigilant, so vindictive and vengeful, so pitiless, unsparing, and ubiquitous as religious hate. Paul may have crossed to Europe in the expectation of escaping from it, but he was soon disillusioned. While he would have preferred to be anathema from Christ rather than repay fraternal hate with hate, he contented himself as respects the Jews with a devout prayer for their well-being.* In the old blood feuds there is something ennobling. A vendetta, where a man inherits an insult to his father and lives simply to avenge the insult, and when he fails through death he hands it on to his brother or to his cousin, has in it — in its very challenge of fatality to himself — an element of dignity and of manhood. But the religious spite which treats the opponent as a social outcast, which denies him dignity, truth, grace, steals from him his manhood, and even — what he prizes most of all — his citizenship of the kingdom of God, this undying, vindictive, infuriate, senile, religious spite is the meanest thing our nature ever knows. By noble and effacing brotherly love it ought to be dealt with. If a man despises us, and we refuse to allow him the awful privilege of provoking us, either to utter despite or to indulge dislike, we may do a manly thing. To be filial to God is to love all who bear His name. We must so live that in our souls the shadow of anything so mean, so impotent, so un-Christlike as human scorn never finds a place.

* Rom. ix. 3–x. 1.

IV

1. The author of the Acts, manifestly a Greek by birth and nature,* though reconciled to the Roman Empire,† and by conversion a Christian,‡ had in him hatred and suspicion of the Jew too deeply ingrained to be eradicated by any superficial change. He watches himself most carefully, lest he unduly indulge his hate of the Jew; and his watchfulness makes him more than just, even generous to him.§ He may have expected Paul to have a less troubled course in Europe than he had in Asia, where our author did not know the people. This conclusion is quite independent of any theory

* That the author is one with the writer of the third Synoptic Gospel goes without saying. This follows not only from the style and the vocabulary, but also from θεόφιλος, a name which occurs only in the N.T. in the Preface to both books (Luke i. 3; Acts i. 1), as well as from the phrasing of the Preface to the Acts, which speaks of a πρῶτος λόγος, and implies that Acts is a δεύτερος. From this it follows that the Preface to Luke i. 1–4 is intended to apply to both books; and the same influences which presided over the composition of the one book presided over the writing of the other. This becomes evident when it is seen that in both works religion is so exhibited as to be independent of its official representatives, whoever or whatever they may be.

† This is to be seen not only in the adventure in the prison at Philippi (Acts xvi. 32–8), and at Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 26–8; xxiii. 27), but also in the attitude to the Roman power. Hence Peter converts Cornelius (x. 1–48), Paul the deputy (xiii. 7–12). Nor is Paul to the Romans, as he is to the Jews, a political person and agitator (xviii. 14, 15; xix. 37; xxiii. 29).

‡ The general design of the work is to show the superiority of the Greek to the Jew as a Christian, and so to justify him and his view of Christianity; but our author did not think of the changes which were induced in the religion by the new minds into which it entered. He was not the last of his race to embrace it, or he would have recognized that mere change was not in itself good.

§ This is the obvious explanation of what is called, euphemistically, by Schmiedel in *Encyclop. Biblica*, "inaccuracies of tendency," the "tendency" being first conceived, then explained, then ascribed to our author, and finally his "inaccuracies" are deduced from his "tendency"; while his attitude "towards non-Christian Jews" is said to be "harsh" (cf. ii. 23; vii. 51–53; xviii. 5, 6, 12–17; xix. 13–16), and our idea of Paul to be "completely changed" from what it is in his epistles. He ap-

touching the "we-source" or "fragment."* The diarist may have been either a nameless "man of Macedonia," or one named, though elsewhere, and known; he may have been either Timothy or Titus, either Silas or Luke; but whoever he was, he simply meant to tell the truth and record what he saw. This is all we assume, and there cannot be a smaller assumption. The author of the Acts and the diarist are alike in saying the best possible for their people; and as they are Paul is represented to be.† He is

proaches the proselytes through the synagogue, and does not "betake himself" to the Gentiles till he has been rejected by "the Jews" (cf. xiii. 14, 45, 46; xviii. 4–6; xix. 8, 9). The "inaccuracies" and the "tendency" are purely subjective, matters of conjecture and hallucination in a superfine eye.

* These "fragments," which have as their special note the use of the first person plural, occur as follows: Acts xvi. 10–17; xx. 5–15; xxi. 1–18; xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16. Hence, they are all associated with the missionary or other journeys of Paul by sea, whether from Troas to Philippi (xvi. 10–17); from Macedonia to Miletus (xx. 5–15); thence by Coos and Tyre, Ptolemais and Cæsarea, to Jerusalem (xxi. 1–18); and from Cæsarea to Rome (xxvii. 1–xxxiii. 16). It is called sometimes "the travel document," or "the journey record" (*Encyclop. Biblica*). There is also seen in its predominant connection with Macedonia two indications, (α) of the writer's home, and (β) of his identity with "the man of Macedonia."

† The "tendency" amongst higher critics is, in the reaction against Baur and the criticism of Tübingen, to substitute the Paul of the "we fragments" in Acts for the Paul of the Epistles, on the ground that Baur spared too much to allow us to conceive Paul as a natural and normal person. Yet in the "travel document" such obviously supernatural events occur as the casting out of an "evil spirit" from a possessed damsel (xvi. 16–18), the waking of Eutychus from the sleep of death (xx. 9–12), those connected with Philip's daughters, the Prophetesses, and Agabus, the Prophet (xxi. 9–13), and Paul's own inspired feeling or replies; while in his last journey either on shipboard or on dry land many miracles are narrated, including some acts of healing, an appearance of an angel, a miraculous preservation from a snake-bite. These are surely enough to please anyone hungering for the supernatural. One is safer with Baur, if one wants a strictly natural and normal interpretation of Paul, than with any recent representative of modern historico-literary criticism. This is said in view of the fact that Baur more suspects the author of the Acts of a nefarious design in

a Jew, born in "the dispersion," arrested by his conversion on the way to become a rabbi; and he is too honest to seem other than he is. And as the best thing either can say is said for his people, and "the Gentiles," who inhabit the cities of Asia, and who were not either the kinsmen of the Greeks or, indeed, Europeans at all, are made out to be so wicked and weak as to be pliable in the hands of "the Jews," the implicate is that it would be otherwise in Greek or Roman cities. There the Jews were not only in a minority, but also were too thoroughly despised; and there was too little sympathy with their religion to enable them to become influential.

2. Hence our Greek author is suspicious, even retrospectively, of the Asian men. Antioch in Syria, the city whence Paul, with Barnabas, started on their missionary journey,* and where they returned and reported the result of their labours,† is the only town where the Jews are numerous, yet powerless. At Salamis, in Cyprus, Paul preached "in the synagogue of the Jews"; and at Paphos, in the same isle, he met at the deputy's "a certain sorcerer, a false prophet, a Jew, whose name was Bar-Jesus."‡ Of Perga, in Pamphylia, where John Mark had left them,§ we know more from other sources than the Acts. In the Pisidian Antioch, Paul and Barnabas go to "the synagogue,"‖ where is delivered a speech which gives special offence to Baur,¶ yet in the circumstances it is as natural as anything

using the "we-source," where "he presents himself as an eye-witness and fellow-traveller" ("Paul," E.T., vol. i, p. 13). Now, why should any "nefarious design" in his use of the "we-fragments" be attributed to our author?

* Acts xiii. 1–3. † Acts xiv. 26–28. ‡ Acts xiii. 5–12.

§ Acts xiii. 13–xv. 38, 39. ‖ Acts xiii. 14.

¶ E.T., i, pp. 101–104. Baur's cardinal position is: "the fresher 'Paul' came to the work, the more clearly he ought to display the Pauline spirit." And he adds how little the address "bears a Pauline character."

in the Epistle to the Galatians. The address delivered, the Jews trooped "out of the synagogue"; but the "Gentiles" remained behind, rejoicing in the unwonted note of hope in the word of promise, and "besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath."* And Antioch did not forget, and "almost the whole city came together to hear the word of God."† But "the Jews, filled with envy," contradicted Paul and blasphemed, "stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas," and expelled them.‡ They consequently "came unto Iconium," where the old story was repeated, and "the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected against the brethren." Their attitude waked the old spirit in Paul and Barnabas, who abode a long time in Iconium; "but the multitude of the city was divided; and part held with the Jews, and part with the apostles." §

V

1. Paul and Barnabas, therefore, at the delivery of an assault fled from Iconium to Lystra,|| where a curious yet

Yet no man had a clearer idea than Baur, when "apology" did not get in his way, of what "development" signified. He compares, in support of the thesis that Peter and Stephen and Paul have but one address among them, the speech given in Pisidian Antioch, as reported in Acts xiii., with those attributed to Peter and to Stephen. As regards Stephen's, he compares vii. 17 with xiii. 17; and as regards Peter, he compares xiii. 23–30 with x. 37–41 and iii. 13–17. Special attention is invited to iii. 17 and xiii. 27, as well as iii. 15 and xiii. 30. He emphasizes the fact that "the same argument is drawn from the same passage of the Psalms" (xvi. 10), but does not explain why the principal passages cited from the O.T. by Paul are not found in Peter's speech (Ps. ii. 7; Isa. lv. 3). He confesses, too, that the conclusion (xiii. 38, 39) is Pauline, without any parallel in the earlier speeches; and fails to explain—the omission is here fatal, especially when the man himself and his audience are taken into account—why it would have miscarried and been esteemed discourteous.

* Acts xiii. 42. † Acts xiii. 44.
‡ Acts xiii. 45–50. § Acts xiv. 1–4. || Acts xiv. 11,12.

characteristic incident happened. Lystra took Barnabas and Paul for gods. That is an elegant as well as eloquent touch where Barnabas, the silent man, is taken for the greater god, and where Paul, the man who speaks, is taken for the minor deity.* The ideal of these Gentiles was to be idle; and so supposing the supreme to be a silent god, they held the insignificant man to be the more Divine. Hence they brought oxen — garlanded, perfumed, made ready for sacrifice — to offer unto these descended deities. Think of the agony to Paul to have men coming to him as if he were himself the Messiah.† From that to stoning there was but a step; stupid adoration is but a form of still more stupid dislike. It is only what we expect when we read that, after their fit of enthusiastic adoration, Paul was stoned and left for dead. There was, indeed, little wonder that in these cities "the souls of the disciples" needed to be strengthened, and to learn that "only through much tribulation could men enter the kingdom of God."‡

2. But the old story was repeated in Lystra. "Jews from Antioch and Iconium came thither and persuaded the people,"§ and Paul "departed with Barnabas to Derbe."|| That city is the farthest point which they reached and where they preached. Thence "they returned to Lystra, to Iconium, and to Antioch,"¶ and "after they had passed throughout Pisidia they came to Pamphylia,"** where John and Mark left them.†† And "when they had preached the word in Perga," from a point on the coast they also sailed to another point opposite Cyprus, Seleucia, whence they had started, and thence they reached the Syrian Antioch.‡‡ When Paul restarted, accompanied by Silas,

* Acts xiv. 11, 12. † Acts xiv. 14–17. ‡ Acts xiv. 22.
§ Acts xiv. 19. || Acts xiv. 20. ¶ Acts xiv. 21.
** Acts xiv. 24, 25. †† Acts xiii. 13 to xv. 38. ‡‡ Acts xiii. 4; xiv. 26.

the ancient tale was again repeated. He may have gone "through Syria and Cilicia,"* but Iconium, Derbe and Lystra were the main scenes of his labours.† Paul

* Gal. i. 21; Acts xv. 41.

† xvi. 1. The question as to whether these were the cities addressed in the Epistle to the Galatians, or where they were, whether in the South or in the North, of the Roman province of Galatia, is primarily one of interpretation. The Epistle to Galatians raises many geographical questions, especially since Sir William Ramsay raised the matter of Southern *v.* Northern Galatia. In what we call Asia Minor two things were notable: (i.) territorial, (ii.) ethnological changes. The territorial may be said to be due to the ethnological; but only in part. They were due more to a change of masters than of men, or a movement of the peoples; and the Roman Empire was the most masterful, as it was the last of the great world-powers. The ethnology was thus quite as mixed as the provinces or the territories. There were quite a number of tribes, and the Gaul may have been one of them; if we are to believe our classical authorities, whose testimony, however, seldom amounts to more than the expression of an opinion, Strabo and Polybius, Justin and Jerome, and even such critical moderns as Holm (vol. iv. 90) and Sir W. M. Ramsay. But there is no need to discuss the question further. It is otherwise, however, with the question as to the silence of the author of the Acts concerning (i.) the founding of the Churches of Galatia, and (ii.) the movement which we know as the movement of the Judaisers. The epistle which is designed to counteract their teaching may be said to be chiefly concerned with the apostleship of Paul, which covers indeed his authority, views, mission, status, character. In its broadest sense this may be said to be the theme of the entire epistle; but in its narrower it only embraces chapters i. and ii. Chapters iii. and iv. to verse 7 have to do with doctrine. From iv. 8, v. to end of chapter, is occupied with personal statements, a section which deals with the interpretation of the Old Testament, and discussions on liberty, which involves the new law of love. Chapter vi. to the end the epistle is largely taken up with duty, and may be said to have its keynote in vi. 10, which runs thus: "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith."

Galatians is an epistle addressed to many churches situated in several cities. I have said that chapters i. and ii. are mainly occupied with Paul's apostleship, which is seen to concern many, nay, all Gentiles, though only Barnabas and Titus are alluded to in their representative characters; and all Jews as Peter, James, and John. Paul declines to be made an apostle either through men or by man, but claims to be what he is by Jesus Christ and God the Father. He is a delegate of the brethren, which here means "the

and Silas were there at Lystra; they were joined by Timothy, who — always a favourite with Paul — was "the

Churches of Galatia." May I call attention to the peculiarity of the phrase? He does not speak to them as "saints" (Rom. i. 7; 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1; Eph. i. 1), nor does he address them as citizens of one city as if they were met as members in one "church" (1 Cor. i. 2; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1), but as so many "churches" which were scattered in several cities. The superscription and name of author runs from chapter i. 1–5. The paragraph that expresses his wonder that men who were at first enthusiastic supporters of him and his Gospel "should so soon have fallen away into another Gospel which is not another Gospel," belongs to the introduction. It is as if Paul had suddenly pulled himself up and said, "I cannot name anything as good news which is neither new nor good, and therefore there is no gospel save one which, like God Himself, admits of no second." Those "troublers" are quickly and easily sketched, as they are in the paragraph which extends i. 6–10. A second paragraph, which opens the main subject of the epistle, and shows his Gospel as not "after man," runs from 11–24. Like his apostleship this Gospel is neither through men nor by man, but of God the Father and Jesus Christ, His Son. The same paragraph contains references to (1) his pre-eminence in the Jews' religion, and (2) his profit in that religion which is, as it were, equal to the traditions of the fathers. The rest of the chapter may be thus summarized: (i.) The good pleasure of God in him, who separates him to his work from his mother's womb and calls him by His grace. (ii.) The revelation of the Son in him first on the way to Damascus, later in His providence; as well as in his maintained being (iii.) The purpose for which the Son was revealed:—that he should "preach Him among the heathen." There is also (iv.) the failure to go up to Jerusalem to be delegated to this work by the apostles, his going instead into Arabia, and his returning into Damascus. (v.) After three years he goes up to Jerusalem to see Peter; and he distinguishes James "the Lord's brother," who holds an eminent position in the local church, from the other James, "the brother of John" and an apostle. (vi.) He goes into Syria and Cilicia. Cf. Acts xv. 41. (vii.) He declares himself unknown by face unto the Churches of Judæa, but while he is unknown by face he is well known by reputation. It admirably sums up the record in Acts.

Chapter ii. has two great scenes, at Jerusalem and at Antioch, and these are noticed in succession. The Jerusalem scene described in verses 1 to 10 happened fourteen years later, Paul's companions being Barnabas and Titus: (i.) He goes up by "revelation," and not as the delegate of any church as at Antioch. This is not, therefore, the journey narrated in Acts xv. (ii.) He goes to communicate "the Gospel" which he preached among the Gentiles. (iii.) Titus is taken as a Greek, and, as is here stated,

son of a certain woman which was a Jewess and believed," and whose father was a Greek. Timothy was "well reported

was not compelled to be circumcised. But (iv.) "false brethren, surreptitiously introduced, who came in privily to spy out our liberty in Christ Jesus," make all attempts at privacy unavailing, and Paul does not for a single moment give place to them. He has nothing to conceal, and everything to gain by publicity. (v.) In public conference those who "seemed to be somewhat" do not add anything of any consequence to Paul's Gospel." (vi.) The men with Peter, James, and John, encourage Paul to preach to the Gentiles. (vii.) The only qualification they add is one Paul says he is jealous for, the remembrance of the poor.

The scene at Antioch has been described, *supra* (pp. 499 ff.), and I have only to add two qualifying positions: (i.) We cannot tell where Paul's discourse to Peter at Antioch ends. (ii.) In any case verses 20–21 are excluded. The end is shrouded, and more agrees with John's, or the Fourth Gospel's, method than with Paul's.

Chapter iii. to iv. 7 is concerned with doctrine, and may be said to have as its thesis, the truth and divinity of a gospel free from the Law, though not without "purple patches" and hints of personal qualities, as when he speaks to the Galatians: "Oh, foolish Galatians," and adds, "who hath bewitched you?" Yet these are rare. The principle of the whole may be said to concern "Jesus Christ as set forth before your eyes crucified among you." There is (i.) an appeal to experience: "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" (ii.) There is the great example or influence of their folly; having begun in the Spirit they seek to be perfected in the flesh. (iii.) In verses 3–6 there are arguments touching the children as well as Abraham their father. (iv.) In 7 and 8 there are further references to Abraham. (v.) In 10 certain persons are said to be "under the curse of the law," and a noticeable point is that these references were intelligible mainly to the Jew and not at all to the Greek, which means that "the Churches of Galatia" had been replenished from the Synagogue and were of the same material as other Christian Churches, as stated in Acts. (vi.) In 11 the argument is as to a man who is justified by faith in the sight of God. The law is said not to be of faith, but instead to be a great institution of works. The verses between 11 and 14 may be said to be an exposition of the question about the just living by faith, which means "just by faith" rather than "the just shall live." (vii.) From verses 15 to 18 the Gospel may be said to be not simply a fulfilment of the promise that "the just by faith shall live," but the covenant of promise is older than the covenant of law. "The covenant of promise" was given to Abraham; "the covenant of law," on the other hand, was given to Moses; and in this paragraph (v. 16), occurs the famous saying as to the seeds and as to "thy seed which is Christ," whereon Origen commented. Paul did not know Greek when he said it. (viii.) In verse 19 there is raised an important question, the purpose of the law which is said to be "added

of by the brethren," and Paul, "because of the Jews," took and circumcised him.* The decree of the council at Jerusalem was proclaimed and everywhere made welcome.†

because of transgressions," and when that is said all is said that need be. (ix.) In iv. 1 he distinctly claims heirship as the right of all Christian men who therefore are said to be "heirs according to the promise," and "an heir so long as he is a child differeth nothing from a servant even though he be Lord of all." (x.) In this many have seen a hint of Paul's knowledge of Roman law. What follows, then, is a declaration of faith based not on history so much as on experience. The conclusion reached is stated in verse 7.

In the section which follows, iv. 8–vi. 10, there is a definition of the ethics involved in Paul's apostleship and doctrine, while enough is said about the "foolish Galatians" to make the fame of any classical writer, or be the fortune of any one in search of racial features. (i.) The question in paragraph 8 to 11 is raised: "What then were ye when ye knew no God?" It is emphatically true of the pagan Greek, as the previous argument was true of the Jew, that "ye did service unto them which by nature are not gods?" "Wherefore do ye turn again to the weak and beggarly elements of the world." That involves a reproach. In other words, What kind of heathens are ye? Better than your neighbours? Nay, you were not; and ye do no better than they when ye observe days and months and seasons and years. (ii.) The apostle argues that men should be as he is, for he is as men are. Not only is there a fine reference to himself, but also to the Galatian character, quick to change, to the readiness with which men who received Paul as an angel of God turned upon and rent him. Where is, then, he asks, the blessedness ye speak of? And a reference to their "own eyes" means that while they would have given their eyes to him, he as a Christian man could not receive a gift which would have only deformed themselves. He asks, therefore, whether he has become their enemy because he tells the truth. He says "it is good to be counted honest," and he desires that Christ again be formed in them. (iii.) It is here where the famous allegory of the two covenants, the two mountains, the two mothers, and the two sons is introduced, and we are said to be "not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." According to Jewish law the woman had the right therefore to make her child as she was, bond or free. (iv.) He exhorts, therefore, men to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and not to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage. (v.) There is the reference to circumcision, which means "that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing." Circumcision is said to avail nothing, nor can anything except faith which worketh by love. (vi.) Liberty is not to be used as giving the flesh its opportunity, but is the service of love, which fulfils the law. I hold, therefore, that Galatians as a whole was written not to one Church, but to many Churches, and to as many cities and sets of men.

* Acts xvi. 1–3. † xvi. 4.

VI

1. The author of the Acts was, as we have said, (i) a Greek, and (ii) he was by birth and blood opposed to the Jew.* Now it is not possible to bring out the full meaning of this double statement otherwise than by an inquiry into another question: how are the Greeks denoted in the Acts of the Apostles? To discuss this point intelligently, a distinction must be drawn between the author who is a historian and him who is simply a person. The historian is an author who speaks for others, while the person speaks for himself. The historian has to do with other men's opinions, while the person must be studied if we would know his method and his mind.

And here we must distinguish between the author and the man he represents, as between ancient and modern nomenclature, especially in anthropology. Paul, for example, differs from us when he names some men "Gentiles" and other men "Jews," simply because he is more in search of a religious than of a racial distinction; while what we

* The author of the Acts has references which can best be explained by the classical knowledge which he owed partly to his birth and partly to his education as a physician; the physicians of his time being an educated class, whose contributions to Greek philosophy and literature were not only of a highly elaborate and literary order, but also of scientific worth and of an instructive and singularly valuable kind. See Ritter, *History of Philos.*, vol. iv, p. 259, and Zeller, *Geschichte der Griech. Philos.*, ii, 14, both text and notes. Acts xvii. 22 ff.; xix. 24, 27, 28, 32, 34, 35, 39, 41; xxi. 28; xxv. 19; xxvii. 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 21, not to speak of the account of Athens, with its description of "Stoicks and Epicureans," and its citation from Aratus, as given in chapter xvii., or verse 22 where he reports a term as being used in its strict classical sense—are among the instances of Greek knowledge. Wellhausen says on page 86 of his commentary on Luke, "eine gangbare griechische Redensort"; which is the more remarkable as he had explained an idiom used in the previous verses as "ein Semitismus." In these passages there is evidence enough to satisfy any one who knows Hebrew and Greek how little Luke was a Hebrew scholar and how much a Greek one.

seek is more racial than religious. He speaks, therefore, as a man who thinks with the mind of a Jew concerning the men who are to him "Gentiles." Jesus, who in this respect proved Himself equal to His reputed ancestry, warns "the twelve"* against what He terms "the way of the Gentiles,"† who need "conversion,"‡ and use in prayer "vain repetitions,"§ hoping to be heard for their "loud" as well as their "much speaking."‖ Jesus did not say anything that in violence exceeded Jewish dislike, but He spoke of the Gentile as no better than a dog,¶ and Paul as "a Hebrew of the Hebrews"** was therefore enough a son of the tribe to think of the Gentiles as men who were and did what was evil,†† who were "vain in their imagination,"‡‡ who did not wish "to retain God in knowledge," given over to be reprobate in mind,§§ without Law, or Christ,‖‖ or hope, or God.¶¶ The Gentile was, therefore, to Paul as to Jesus, a man who worshipped "dumb idols"*** which were "nothing in the world"††† and knows God "in the lust of concupiscence."‡‡‡ They were men who walked in the vanity of their mind and in "a darkened understanding,"§§§ and did not see the light of life. Hence he felt bound to speak the word of God to "the Jew first and also to the Greek."‖‖‖ He thinks, therefore, of the Gentile as hearing the word of God,¶¶¶ owing to the apostasy of Israel. Paul speaks simply as a man educated by Jews, who knew their distinction of race, and who, brought up in a Greek

* Matt. x. 1, 2; Mark iii. 14.
† Matt. x. 5.
‡ Matt. x. 18; xxiv. 14–24, 32.
§ Matt. vi. 7.
‖ Matt. xviii, 17.
¶ Mark vii. 26–28; Matt. xii. 21–27.
** Phil. iii. 5.
†† Eph. ii. 1–3.
‡‡ Rom. i. 21.
§§ Rom. i. 28.
‖‖ Rom. ii. 12–15.
¶¶ Eph. ii. 11–12.
*** 1 Cor. xii. 2; cf. Ps. cxv. 5–7; Jer. x. 2–5.
††† 1 Cor. viii. 4; x. 19.
‡‡‡ 1 Thess. iv. 5.
§§§ Eph. iv.
‖‖‖ Rom. i. 13–16; ii. 9–11; Acts xiii. 41; xviii. 5–6; xxii. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 16.
¶¶¶ Rom. xi. 2, 11–12.

city amongst Greek men, knew theirs also. The Greek was to him a more refined person than the Jew, but the Jew was more moral than the Greek. Paul laid emphasis on this point, insisting that the Jew, therefore, was the stronger.* Modern knowledge and ideas have in this respect stood more by the Jew than by the Greek, for we hold the moral to be simpler and broader, purer and more fundamental, than any intellectual difference. We agree, therefore, with Paul in holding that the race which worshipped wisdom had more vanity, though less truth, than the race which worshipped God. Now where God is worshipped as such He is conceived as no respecter of persons, belonging neither to Jew nor Greek, but simply to man.† And Paul did not think that while the speech he daily used was Greek, and the law he daily obeyed was Roman, yet that either he or any one of his blood stood on a lower level than the lowest of the Latin races. There is indeed nothing too audacious in the sphere of personal superiority for racial vanity to assert.

2. While Paul as apostle to the Gentiles magnified his office, still, as a Jew who had been in training for a rabbi, he was made welcome in the synagogue, where he testified that Jesus was the Christ.‡ The distinction, therefore, between

* 1 Cor. v. 1. Paul here expresses shame at a sin, which even Gentiles are so ashamed of as not even to name, being known among Christians. The deference to law as moral he brought from Jerusalem. Cf. Rom. xi. 11, 13.

† Rom. ii. 11; Gal. ii. 6; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; Rom. iii. 29–30.

‡ What, then, is the relation between the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles? It has been represented as strained, and the strain has been, at any rate since the days of Baur, very much exaggerated and criticized. The third Gospel has the other two synoptics, as well as the fourth, to be compared with, but the Acts of the Apostles stands alone, though so far as it relates to Paul it can be corrected and supplemented by his epistles. There is no doubt that to challenge the Book of Acts is to measure it by modern standards, which it cannot face and stand un-

the Jew and Gentile, though begun in the Old Testament, was yet followed in the New. But in the apocryphal literature a step forward is taken, and "Greek" is substituted for "Gentile." This linguistic change signified (i) that the term had become more extensive, (ii) that Greek was the current speech of man, and as far as the Jewish knowledge of him went the term went, and (iii) there was associated with the term its antithesis, which embraced the Jew as well as the Gentile, and so denoted mankind. Indeed, while the author of the Acts cannot write his history without dependence on Hellenistic reports by Jewish men, yet his use of the term is such as betrays his Hellenic descent. We can say, therefore, that the author of the Acts was not

changed, especially if the epistles speak seriously touching Paul. The remarkable things are: (i.) how little Paul speaks concerning his inner experience and his past life; (ii.) how little Acts speaks concerning not merely the Pauline Epistles, but their origin; and (iii.) how little certain minor characters in his life, like Titus, are noted. And these are not what are expected in a modern biography, and we can only bring use and wont to bear in our criticism in a case like this. It is possible, indeed, that Baur may have much exaggerated, and we confess that Luke, as a writer, has had very hard measure dealt out to him. I may take as a single instance his relations to the Synagogue. The Synagogue played in the Acts a very considerable part, and in the history of the Christian Church it played a part still more considerable, especially in two respects. (i.) It became a model to the Church of organization and of fitness for work; and (ii.) the Synagogue was the place where Paul met many Jews, and there alone devout persons, or proselytes, could be found. It is not possible to conceive any just reason why Titus, for example, should not be recognized. It is not true that he is ignored of set purpose any more than Luke himself is, whose name does not once occur in the Acts, as either the author or as a companion of Paul. And Titus is dealt with similarly, not because he has an epistle to himself, and is referred to frequently in 2 Corinthians, especially in chapters ii. vii. viii. and xii., and in Galatians ii. 1, 3 he is made to play a notable part in a grand controversy. Yet his non-appearance has nothing trivial in it. We may be astonished why Titus does not appear in the Acts, yet we are astonished without sufficient reason. If Luke's attitude to the Synagogue be taken account of as well as his attitude to Judaism as a whole, then his attitude to Titus who, like himself, is a Greek is not surprising.

only a man from Macedonia, but he had also the peculiar Greek nature which hated the Jew and anticipated good results from Paul's incursion into Europe.

3. Our author thought, indeed, that the European Greeks were certain to be either more favourable or more indifferent to the new religion than any Eastern race. To his mortification he found that neither expectation was verified. The fairness and the truth of the man stand revealed in the way he describes Paul's adventures at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berœa. At Philippi, while many welcomed the Apostle and while the city proved worthy of Macedonia, of Greece, and of its own history and preëminence, it was, as a whole, hostile.* He may have been one of the crowd which "sat by the river side" and "spake unto the women who resorted thither." He may have been of those "constrained" by Lydia to enter her house and abide there. He may have been followed by the "damsel possessed with a spirit of divination"; but we know he was not with "Paul and Silas" when they were taken before "the magistrates,"† charged with "being Jews" and "teaching customs" which no law-abiding Roman could observe. And the multitude rose up together against "Paul and Silas," who were "cast into prison," with their "feet made fast in the stocks." Therefore the brethren needed to be comforted. At Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews, Paul, "according to his manner," used it, "opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead," and "that this Jesus" is indeed "the Messiah." "And some of them believed." For them to believe was also for them to "consort with Paul and Silas." "A great multitude" of the Greek prose-

* The travel document, which begins at Troas, continues at Philippi. (Acts xvi. 11–18.)

† xvi. 20 ff.

lytes believed. It was then when "the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company and set all the city on an uproar," and cried to its rulers: "These men that have turned the world upside down are come hither."* Then Paul and Silas are sent away to Berœa, where they "went into the synagogue of the Jews."† And we read that the men of Berœa were "more noble" than the men of Thessalonica in that they searched the Scriptures "with all readiness of mind" to discover "whether things were so." The result is said to be that "many of them believed."‡ But when the "Jews of Thessalonica had knowledge that the word of God was preached of Paul at Berœa," they came as a multitude and "stirred up the people";§ and Paul went towards the sea, leaving Silas and Timotheus behind. The brethren who conducted him brought him to Athens, where he stayed some days. While at Athens we read that Paul, while waiting for Timotheus and Silas, had "his spirit stirred" by seeing the city "wholly given to idolatry." He disputes "in the synagogue with the Jews and with the proselytes," and daily "in the market with them that met him." "Certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoicks encountered him, and some said, What will this babbler say? Others said, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods," confounding the Deity not only with Jesus, but also with the Resurrection.|| The author of the Acts characterized as well as criticized the Athenians, who are said to spend "their time in nothing else but either to hear or tell some new thing."¶ Athens was the most characteristic of Greek cities, and it was characteristic, for it was not only

* Acts xvii. 1–8. † xvii. 10. ‡ xvii. 11–12.
§ xvii. 13. || xvii. 16–18. ¶ xvii. 21.

a city of trade, but preëminently of learning, and the ancient Greek was nothing if not learned. It was a city where men were educated, and where they therefore regarded every person who visited it as seeking wisdom: no other purpose was recognized by them and theirs. We have, then, in Athens a city that is a type of Greece at its best and noblest. It may not have been very noble, but it was Greece at its best, and Greece was courteous, though neither flexible nor easily moved. Here, then, we must imagine Paul; among a race which knew its intellectual superiority to the rest of mankind, and in a city it had created as its congenial home. The population was too typically Greek to be inflamed by any foreign race, especially by one esteemed lower than itself, like the Jews. But even in this city they had a synagogue, which Paul sought out, and where he "disputed," though not with a crowd of "the baser sort," "lewd fellows," the scum and offscouring of great cities. At Athens, however, he made two notable discoveries: (i) that curiosity to hear was not the same thing as the passion to know, and (ii) that the politeness which listened for news was generically unlike the desire which listened for the voice of God and wished to obey His truth. And these discoveries resulted in changed feelings. Paul found that polite indifference was more hostile than even the passion of the crowd. The easy tolerance of error is but a poor substitute for diligent search for God. And so Athens produced its inevitable influence in the mind of the persons who sought for Deity more earnestly than men dig for secret treasure. But Paul could not leave without speech; and his address at Athens is reported. And the report is, though condensed, yet a fair sample of what Paul was accustomed to say to cultivated heathen. He begins to speak as a cultured Jew, though he ends as a Christian. He

was too courteous an opponent to use the phrase, "You are too superstitious."* Superstition is the thing that survives or the belief that lasts out of one state, which is lower, into another state, which is the higher. And so we say, not "too superstitious," but "too much given to religious observances." For ye are "excessive in your reverence, and multiply too easily objects of devotion." And then, as is his wont, as he had done in the address which is set down as delivered by him in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch, he cannot proceed without a text, and cites one, as it were, where he has "found an altar with this inscription, To the unknown God."† This God is revealed (i) as the Creator who made the World, (ii) as the Lord of Heaven and Earth, (iii) as dwelling not in Temples made with hands, for He not only made the World, but He governs it; and so (iv) He has made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the whole face of the earth;‡ (v) but He has definitely decided that they shall seek Him. That leads to the famous saying, "In Him we live and move and have our being"; and then "certain of their own poets" are quoted as saying, "We are also His offspring."§ From this there follows a strictly Jewish conclusion: — "Since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Deity is like unto gold or silver or stone, graven by the art and the device of man"|| — though it is obvious that history, which has falsified the argument, ought not to be trusted as a mere revelation of God. But, here speaks the Christian as distinct from the Jew: — it is evident "the command to repent," as well as all the previous positions, involves more than a bare and bald theism, whether Jewish and historical, or natural. A relation of the Creator to Nature exclusive of man cannot be called "natural"; for (i) the same God who created

* Acts xvii. 22. † xvii. 23. ‡ xvii. 26. § xvii. 28. || xvii. 29.

and governs man appointed in the person of Christ a Judge for the world; (ii) God will judge the world, but He can do so only by deputing one who has lived in it and led it; (iii) "in righteousness"; no one but a "righteous judge" could do it, and to be righteous is to be merciful; (iv) He must "judge the world" as He must measure it by man; (v) the only man God can trust is the man whom He had ordained as Judge of "quick and dead"; (vi) men needed to be sure their faith was right: such assurance God gave who raised Him from the dead. That was more than even the Greeks could stand. The word there became too insistent to please them; "some mocked and others" politely "said, We will hear thee again of this matter." But we read, "Howbeit some clave unto Him." God had not left Himself without a witness even in Athens.

VII

1. "Paul departed from Athens and came to Corinth," * "and he continued there a year and six months teaching the Word of God." † The most marvellous result of his visit is in Acts passed over in silence: — his learning to express himself in literary form, always a difficult art to acquire, and an art as unique as it is difficult. For in Corinth he writes epistles as dissimilar as those "to the Thessalonians" and "to the Galatians." But there are the three events which all concern either persons or their respective peoples, described in our narrative: — (i) Paul was of the same craft as Aquila, with whom he is said to have worked and lodged.‡ This Aquila is never mentioned without his wife, Priscilla.§ Aquila is said to be a Jew, though

* Acts xviii. 1. † xviii. 11. ‡ xviii. 3.

§ In the Pauline Epistles she bears the name Prisca, which is without the termination that makes it into a diminutive (Rom. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 19). Priscilla is a form it invariably assumes in the more familiar style of Acts (Acts xviii. 2, 18, 26).

"born in Pontus,"* and the Emperor Claudius "had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome," where the husband and the wife had together lived. Silas and Timotheus had come from Macedonia.†

(ii) "Paul reasoned in the Synagogue"‡ and we read further that he "testified," "Jesus is the Messiah." But when the Jews "blasphemed he shook out his raiment,"§ which has been described as the act of an angry man. The Jews were often found dwelling in the neighbourhood of the Synagogue, and several people are named as in the Church at Corinth whom we know to have been Jewish either in blood or by faith, like the Justus, into whose house, which "joined hard to the Synagogue," Paul entered;|| and "the chief Ruler of the Synagogue," Crispus, who "believed on the Lord with all his house."¶ Many of the Corinthians are also said to believe and to be baptized, though we know that Paul mainly prided himself on Christ having sent him to preach the Gospel and not to baptize in His name.**

(iii) As to the third incident which concerns Gallio,†† Statius ‡‡ and Seneca,§§ who was Nero's tutor yet Gallio's younger brother, who, as uncle of the poet Lucan, was of quite a literary family, unite in applying to him the same term, *dulcis;* and so make us seem as if we stood near a sweet and generous man. Of Claudius he perpetrates the one

* xviii. 2. This is one of the important incidents connected with the Roman Empire embedded in Acts. For another, which also concerns Claudius, see xi. 28.

† xviii. 5. Silas seems to have died during the mission in Corinth, for he does not again appear in Acts.

‡ Acts xviii. 4, 5. § xviii. 6. || xviii. 7.

¶ xviii. 8. Paul alludes to Crispus (1 Cor. i. 14).

** 1 Cor. i. 13, 15, 17.

†† xviii. 12–17. He owed his surname of Gallio to a simple fact: his adoption as a son by Junius Gallio, a rhetorician (cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* vi. 3). Achaia was the name of the Roman province which had been the kingdom of Greece in which Corinth was. Gallio is described as pro-consul of Achaia. ‡‡ Silv. xxvii. 32. §§ Nat. Qu., Preface, § 4.

literary witticism which still survives as his. The emperor, a most timid and worthless man, who had been poisoned by Agrippina, and speaks of him as of an emperor who had experienced apotheosis and was with the gods, yet as a criminal who had been drawn "with a hook" through the streets.* Read in the light of the character usually given to him, Gallio was not indifferent to religion, but rather a man who, as sweet in nature, loved sweetness in religion. There was nothing that pleased a Jew, or that displeased a Roman, more than to be a martyr for his faith; but Jewish orthodoxy was too much inclined to build on authority, rather than on the law in the man. While Gallio understood Roman law, he did not understand the Jewish, and he refused to interfere with Judaism or simply with religion. The conclusion he reached had nothing to do with religion as such, though it had first reference to the beating of Sosthenes before his judgment seat.

2. Paul's residence in Corinth we have said was remarkable for the growth of his mind. This growth is mainly seen in the epistles that bear his name, and that form the basis of our New Testament. While he contributes to it in literary material less than Luke, and only a little more than Mark and Matthew combined, it is yet more than doubtful whether it could have been without him. There is in our canon much that is anonymous, much also pseudonymous. Some books bear the name of the authors, others the person or persons, or society addressed; some are written by the person whose name they bear, others claim to be the work of men who did not know the ideas they praised, or the institutions they approved. Some have had names assigned them by a tradition which knew neither the men it proclaimed as authors, nor the ideas they were credited

* Diocassius, lx. 35.

with preaching. Others — notably the Pauline letters — have had names affixed by a tradition so sober and sure that its judgment has been more confirmed than shaken by modern research. Only a hasty inquirer would say that to be found false in one thing is to be proved capable of falsity in all. — Though the authors be obscure and unknown, yet the words are not as the men are, provincial in spirit and in blood. While as a rule they are men without culture or literary faculty, who write in what was a foreign tongue acquired imperfectly because late in life, still they have, in spite of their undistinguished and unclassical style, yet produced a literature which, in its appeal to the intellect and conscience, to the imagination and heart, to the sense of the eternal, and the feeling of the good in man, stands absolutely alone amid the literatures of the world.

3. The Pauline letters, while not intended to be historical, are so really. They show us the actual Church, but suggest the ideal. They show us how Christian men then lived and thought, how, while forming the actual world, they yet reached out into an ideal; how they endeavoured to read the mind, to reproduce the character, and to interpret the person of Him whom they adored; how they had struggled and succeeded, which caused the writer pleasure; and failed, which caused him pain. They ought to be conceived as contemporary documents, glowing with an ideal too large and too comprehensive to be impersonated by those who simply wanted a new religion, and were contented that it was not as the old. For it is incorrect to say that these letters are without historical interest, or even significance. So much indeed is this opposed to fact that their characteristics may be summed up thus: — (i) They are contemporary documents which witness to facts of primary importance; their very biographical becomes

an historical interest when they testify to the quality of the ideas that filled their writer's mind. (ii) They show the growth of Christian ideas and institutions, their action on old environments, and the action of new environments on them. (iii) They exhibited the continuity of the Old Testament with the New, and its interpretation by a Jew who had lived both within and without Palestine; and by the Christian, whether of Jewish, Greek, Roman, or mixed descent. (iv) They show also how the new religion was influenced by Roman ideas of law and justice, especially by the dream of empire, and the consequent ideal of character. (v) We can trace the mode and the degree in which the Greek mind affected the Christian, and, in the moment of early collision, forecast the future. (vi) They reveal also the action of the varied races upon the religion — races it now attracted and now repelled, the way the men it converted behaved, whether within or without the Church. (vii) They also show what were the social and religious ideas which were common to all mankind, and what ideas the new religion introduced.

VIII

1. Letters and literature are distinct, yet related, whether as ideas or as things. Books which are here conceived as constituting literature, are impersonal, and offer what is significant in and for itself, or things which tend to education and culture, to philosophy and science, to history and knowledge. But letters which are written messages are personal, and possess the qualities of good conversation, serving a like purpose. They are written by intelligent men to men of intellect in order to annihilate the space which divides persons, though it may create the absence which makes the heart grow fonder. Yet the distinction

is strictly relative, for the letter, as more personal than the book, is written to instruct or amuse certain individuals by informing them of what has happened to the writer, and the letter which fails to interest fails utterly as regards its purpose. The Pauline letters are written to a Church by an absent teacher, and have as their immediate practical purpose the direction of the persons addressed, who to the person addressing them represent the world. They are epistles, therefore, that speak truth to all and for all, though the truth they speak is swathed in local forms and ephemeral allusions.

2. The Pauline letters must therefore be studied as letters which are designed to dispel ignorance, yet as expressing ideas of permanent value, and of individual interest. Their writer makes Christianity literary. It is possible that this was his greatest achievement. Not only are his letters the oldest documents of the Christian religion, but also its translation into the literary forms that were then current and common. While destined at its birth to speak the language of Syria, it yet came to use the tongue of Greece; and in this alien speech it felt more at home than even in the tongue in which it was born. The nature expressed in these letters is older than the religion because as old as man. In them is humanity with its lofty idealism, with its strength of conviction, its heroism and devotion, its love and majesty, with its bigotry and intolerance, its fear of change, its hatred of suspicion. These epistles must therefore be read as genuine letters, beautiful with emotion, tender, wistful, gracious, yet scored with passion, dark, stern and unyielding. They are letters which can be called with truth human documents, because alive with man's common instincts, zeal for truth, love to man, the yearning of the heart for the absent albeit it is a brother, the desire to

lead him or to keep him in the way of right and of peace. In other words, human nature is there in its strength and in its weakness, soft yet severe, rich in an awed humility and vain majesty; full of tenderness to the penitent, gentleness to the erring, yet to men who love evil, as stern as God. Sweet and graciously courteous is the writer, tempering with mercy the fierce fanaticism of the convert. The mind of Jesus is seen trying to make its home in man, teaching him to die for the truth, to bear all things gladly in its name, and for His sake.

3. But it is not enough so to read the Pauline letters. We only begin to understand them when we know the man by whom they are written. Paul has nothing to conceal, and conceals nothing. He is a man proud of his descent, yet ashamed of those who share it.* He loves the Jewish people, their Fathers and their great traditions,† their religion which had done so much for him,‡ their rites which his parents had observed in his own case,§ their customs to which he had conformed,|| the party to which he had belonged,¶ their law,** the revelation which had come through them,†† and the Christ they had, as it were, begotten from their own loins.‡‡ The God he loves knows no difference between Jew and Gentile,§§ and he honours Christ because He has abolished "the middle wall of partition" and made the divided race one.||| He is willing to be 'accursed from Christ" for his brethren, his "kinsmen according to the flesh,"¶¶ yet though for their sakes he would endure the gravest penalty, and says that his heart's desire is that Israel should be saved,*** he will not, even for their

* Rom. ii. 17–29; Phil. iii. 4–6; Gal. iv. 12, 17, 18, 21–31.
† Rom. iv. 1 ff.; ix. 4; xi. 1; Gal. iii. 15. ‡ Gal. i. 14.
§ Phil. iii. 5. || 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 6. ¶ Phil. iii. 5; cf. Acts xxvi. 5.
** Rom. iii. 31; vii. 1, 7, 12; xiii. 10; Gal. ii. 19. †† Rom. iii. 2.
‡‡ Rom. ix. 5. §§ Rom. iii. 22, 29, 30. ||| Eph. ii. 14, 15; Rom. v. 11.
¶¶ Rom. ix. 3. *** Rom. x. 1.

salvation, yield one iota of his faith; for he holds man to be greater than Israel, and God greater than man. The man's conscience is mightier than his heart, his reason stronger than his emotions,* for to him the ideals of life alone make it worth living. And so the spiritual has become greater than the material Israel;† Abraham, the father of the faithful, is a sublime patriarch, with a far larger and more illustrious progeny than a narrow and intolerant race.‡ Hence the note of the new Israel is "the circumcision of the heart," a life "in the Spirit, not in the letter, whose praise is not of man, but of God."§ The God he serves has "no respect of persons."|| He justifies the men who do the law, but gives no preference to the men who have or who hear it.¶ He who lives under the law may be first in privilege, but he is first also in responsibility,** if responsibility before God signifies responsibility for man. The Gospel he preaches is designed equally for Jew and Gentile,†† is meant to abolish distinctions of speech and state, of race and rank;‡‡ to be faithless here would be to be false to God as well as to man, and to allow the conventions of time to triumph over the principles and ideals of eternity. Hence he withstands the illiberal Christian as he had withstood the conventional Jew;§§ he hears the voice of the unborn generations, and he will not barter their inheritance for his own miserable peace.

And so in his letters we see the old in death-grips with the new, which it resists, hates, fears. And while the old calls up the forces of ancient prejudice and invulnerable fanaticism to stand against and cast

* Rom. ii. 13–15. † Rom. ix. 6, 24–28.
‡ Rom. iv. 12, 13; Gal. iii. 7–9, 29. § Rom. ii. 28, 29.
|| Rom. ii. 11; Gal. ii. 6; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25.
¶ Rom. ii. 13, 14. ** Rom. ii. 9, 10. †† Rom. i. 16.
‡‡ Gal. iii. 28. §§ Gal. ii. 11–14.

out the new, yet we see the new claiming its inheritance in the old, and breaking it into pieces if it will not quietly give up and give out the truth it was created to serve, all which means that what is of time will perish and what of eternity endure. We should think all the worse of human nature if these Pauline letters had never been written, were it only to teach us how reluctant man is to become good, and how the forces of night and chaos within him contend against the powers of grace and truth which descend out of heaven from God. They help us to measure the strength and the breadth of the Gospel by showing how it vanquished the man who contended against its mercy and struggled to keep its love as narrow and bitter as his own hate. He who does not see these things in the Pauline letters, will be quite unable to perceive any reason for their being at all or why they formed the nucleus of the canon. He who does thus see will know by what right they stand where they do, and how they could stand nowhere else in the whole range of Christian literature.

4. The letters, then, fill us with admiration for their author, for his strength, his candour, his integrity, his moral passion, his intellectual penetration and fearlessness. He unifies all, stands a rare and genuine human personality with all his ancient hates sacrificed to one abiding love, unashamed of the affection which lies deep within him, and now overflows in his words, and now chokes his utterance. He seems, then, a man, real, sane, stalwart, upright, strong in judgment, prudent, yet kind in speech, tolerant, yet brave in temper, a rare personality, incapable of using language to deceive those who wished to be deceived, of playing either with his own soul or another man's. He is the man of all the apostles most worthy of trust. Men who could have agreed in nothing else would certainly agree in saying:

"He is the person, whether we regard the time or the race, most competent to write a contemporary document which shall, if only by the way, witness to the truth of the new religion, and speak of its Founder as He ought to be spoken about." For his letters move us now with pity, now with scorn, here with love, and there with aversion, for the men they are written to, or about, or against. We dare not do other than sympathize with those who so loved the God their fathers had worshipped, and the way in which they had worshipped Him as to have no choice but to adhere to Him and the ancient ways were it only for the fathers' sakes.* Our feelings may draw us towards the man who so feels the fascination of the idol that he dare not go near his temple;† yet they drive us away from him who allows his old sins to govern his new life.‡ We find it hard to be tolerant to the "weak brother" who so feels his weakness as to judge another as if he were God, in respect of "meats and drinks,"§ but we are moved to tolerance by the plea of the strong man who reminds us that even for "the weak brother" Christ died.|| These are beautiful sayings, altogether worthy of the man who loved much, yet spoke little of love: — "No man liveth to himself or dieth to himself." "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord."¶ "For meat destroy not the work of God."** "Why is my liberty judged by another conscience?" "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."††

5. The letters possess therefore certain common features; they are local yet universal, and discuss particular facts

* Acts xxiv. 14. † 1 Cor. xiii. 4–10. ‡ *Ibid.* 12.
§ Rom. xiv. 1–4; xv. 1. || Rom. xv. 15; 1 Cor. viii. 13.
¶ Rom. xiv. 7, 8. ** *Ibid.* xiv. 20. †† 1 Cor. x. 29–31.

in the light of general principles. Paul learns by practice the art of putting abstract and abstruse things in letters, and it has to be noted that the value of literature has, in general, a new meaning to him after he has been in Athens. And so 1st and 2nd Thessalonians get written near the beginning of his stay in Corinth. They are simple in style, and in matter more comparable to the speeches reported in Acts than to the later letters which proceed from his pen. He shows his humility by associating with himself, as if they were joint authors of his epistles,* "Silas and Timothy." He alludes to his shameful treatment at Philippi before he came to Thessalonica,† and his loneliness at Athens after he had left it.‡ He also refers to the fact that he and they suffered especially from the Jews, and that they were examples to all who believed.§ Towards the end of his stay in Corinth he writes to the Galatian Churches an elaborate and highly technical epistle which is quite unlike either of the earlier ones, while it forecasts his future eminence as a writer of letters; in particular it lets us know how he was affected by his converts as well as by the place, for it is full of the *genius loci*. The influence of Athens can be traced both upon him and upon Corinth, which was imitative of what we should call the Capital of Greece, though Corinth was the larger and richer city. The influence of atmosphere as a quite real thing can be traced, for it affected the independence of Corinth, and even the character of its sons. The city had more than a Greek jealousy for its freedom, while as regards education and speech, its sons were made sensitive to style by the neighbourhood of Athens. The reference indeed to a perfect man means simply a man perfectly educated or full

* 1 and 2 Thess. i. 1.
† 1 Thess. ii. 2.
‡ 1 Thess. iii. 1.
§ 1 Thess. i. 7, 8; ii. 14–16.

grown.* As was the city such was the church; jealous for its rights, its freedom, its competency, its power to correct the offender if such there be, and Paul shows himself as jealous for freedom as either the city or the church, adding to his love of liberty the idea as to its rights and duties. And he reasons with them as reasonable men.

* 1 Cor. ii. 6; xiii. 10; xiv. 20.

IX

PAUL IN ASIA AND IN PRISON

I

1. PAUL, not indeed till he felt that his work in Corinth was completed, turned back from Europe to Asia, following his heart as he had before followed his conscience from Asia to Europe. But it was not the old Asia he went to; it was but a Roman province whose capital, Ephesus,* stood by the sea near Corinth, though on the main road to the East. But it was still nearer in trade, and therefore in character, to the Greek city. While just opposite Samos, and therefore sharing its maritime fame, it was also the home of a peculiar religion, Asiatic in origin and in nature, with a people which, while devoted to their own religion, were so organized as to be able to speak on its behalf to the world. Yet Paul, though he spent a very much longer time in Asia than in Greece, did not feel as happy there, partly because he was uncomfortable from not being in the path of duty.† Why he brought away from Achaia Aquila and his wife, we can, in a measure, at least, in view of what is said later, understand.‡ From Ephesus he sailed to Cæsarea,§ whence he went up to Jerusalem and saluted the saints there. When he had paid his respects to the local church, he went down to Antioch, which, as more polyglot than Jerusalem, and in spirit more free and universal, was

* Acts xviii. 19.
† Acts xix. 8–10.
‡ Acts xviii. 18, 21, 28.
§ Acts xviii. 21–22.

a fitter home for him than the capital of his own race with its narrow and timid and intolerant temper.* And thence he started on another missionary journey, which he began as on previous occasions, with the Galatian cities and churches.† In going over the region of Galatia and Phrygia in order, he strengthened the disciples, and through them the churches.‡

But it is mainly with Ephesus, and with what is known of his conduct there, as well as its conduct to him, that we are to be concerned. There we first meet Apollos, who is termed "a Jew born at Alexandria," and "an eloquent man, mighty in the Scriptures." Yet he, though a diligent student of them, had not known till enlightened by Aquila the way of God,§ a way he quite frankly confessed he did not know in full. He reversed the procedure of Paul, and passed from Ephesus to Corinth, where he "mightily" convinced the Jews, "publicly showing by their own Scriptures that Jesus was the Messiah."|| Apollos so succeeded at Corinth as to form a party which was strong enough for Paul to reckon with, and as became an eloquent man, he was learned and so he stood nearer Athens and its spirit than his contemporary. He had, besides, more of humanity in him than the parties of either Peter or Christ.¶ The party which was named after Christ did not speak Jesus' own mind, but the mind of men who proved their inferiority by their inability to apprehend His meaning, and so they presumed to speak for Him, and interpret Him.

2. The mental growth of Paul continued in Ephesus as remarkable as it had been in Corinth, and by the epistles there written we possess a means of judging what it must

* Acts xiii. 1–4; xv. 40–41.
† Acts xiii. 13 ff.; xiv. 11 ff.; xvi. 1–6.
‡ Acts xviii. 23. § Acts xviii. 24.
|| Acts xviii. 27–28. ¶ 1 Cor. i. 12.

have been. What he continued to write expressed a universal solicitude for his converts, whom he termed his "beloved sons." Though they might have, he said, "ten thousand instructors in Christ," yet they had not and could not have a corresponding number of fathers.* All his letters† were marked by three things: (α) extraordinary emphasis on personal and ethical qualities; (β) the

* 1 Cor. iv. 14–15.

† The first letter to the Corinthian church was written from Ephesus, and falls into sections which make it significant. These sections are mainly two: the (i.) discusses the parties within the church, and raises also questions in which it was deeply interested. It embraces chapters i.–vi., and in Paul's customary method closes with a doxology (1 Cor. vi. 20). (ii.) The second section extends from chapter vii.–xv., excluding xvi., which yet, with its salutations and directions to the church, forms a fitting termination to the whole.

1. In the division which extends from i. to vi. we simply note that we have a discussion which well illustrates the temper of the city, and the influence exercised upon it by the neighbourhood of Athens, and upon the writer himself by his bitter and untoward experiences there. Man is not only gregarious, but he is also, what makes his very gregariousness significant, susceptible to influence. The life lived by Corinth and its citizens was urban, yet it reflected the same spirit as lived in its potent neighbour. (i.) The spirit was seen in many things, particularly in the rise of parties within the church. Some said, "We are of Paul"; others said, "We are of Apollos"; others, "We are of Cephas," the chief apostle; but a fourth party said, "We are of Christ" (1 Cor. i. 12). What the parties signified we need not here specifically discuss, though the parties of "Cephas" and of "Christ" have been, with good historical reasons, identified with the Judaisers of the Galatian epistle. (ii.) Nothing could have insulted the Corinthian church more than to identify it with any person, particularly if a Jew. There was in consequence remarkable jealousy as to Paul himself. We know so much as that from his own teaching, which stands particularly clear in i. 13–17. That has to do with Paul as baptizing, and he is grateful that his custom has kept him from baptizing any save Crispus and Gaius. His reasons were (α) lest any one should say, "I baptized in my own name"; (β) Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel; and (γ) he kept no register of any baptisms he had administered. (iii.) We see that the proximity of Athens had affected not only the Greeks, but the Jews, and even Paul himself. Hence he has much to say about the foolishness of preaching, about the wisdom of Deity, and we can feel how often the same event must have seemed different to different men, especially as the neighbourhood of

fear, for those converted by him, lest he had "be-

Athens made all Greeks and all who used the tongue of Greece and yet lived, as did the men of Corinth, within the Athenian sphere of influence, susceptible to the Greek spirit. (iv.) There are two subjects discussed in the second chapter. (α) One paragraph which extends from 1 to 5 emphasizes the fact that his preaching was not "with excellency of wisdom," but he was with them "in weakness and fear and much trembling," having come to Corinth from Athens, a man who "did not determine to know anything save Christ crucified," and consequently with a Faith which did not stand in the wisdom of men, "but in the power of God." And all references to man's wisdom, which is an affair of words, needs to be read in the light of the fact that Corinth was within the sphere of Athenian influence, cultivated criticism and independence, or love of freedom. But (β) in the second paragraph there is a very striking contrast drawn between the wisdom of the world which, as practical, "comes to nought," and the wisdom which, as uncreated, proceeds from God, and is described as hidden, in a mystery or a spectacle the eyes can see and the hands can handle, "ordained of God before the foundation of the world unto our glory." That, in a purely Pauline way, is confirmed by a quotation he adopts and adapts from the Old Testament: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him" (Isaiah iv. 4). (v.) In the third chapter this theme is continued in the speech which says, "Unto you as unto babes in Christ" the message is given. (α) We have only to think of what the church at Corinth thought of itself, and of its city and people, to feel the audacity of Paul in speaking to them as "unto babes in Christ" who are "not spiritual but carnal" persons. (β) The parties are then taken up, the Pauline and Apollonian alone, to the exclusion of the Petrine and the Christians, being represented. He turns back on the first position and asks, "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, save ministers by whom ye believed?" Paul, who avoids, though for opposite reasons, Cephas and Christ, distinguishes thus: "He plants, Apollos waters, God gives the increase, but neither he that planteth is anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase" is all in all. Paul speaks of himself as a co-labourer with God; but differentiates himself and Apollos from the Corinthian Church, which he calls "God's husbandry." Then while he claims to have laid the foundation of the local church, the foundation of the universal Church no man can lay unless He is also its foundation "which is Jesus Christ." Man is said to be the temple of God, dwelt in by the Divine Spirit. On this an appeal is based which sums up the results of past discussions and forecasts much that emerges later in the epistle. What is summed up is the need of purity and the indwelling of God. The pure in heart shall see Him. What forecasts later discussions is the position that if a man defile the temple of God, God shall destroy him. The temple of God is Holy. He learns, too, that

stowed upon them labour in vain";* and (γ) the discus-

all things are man's, that even Paul, Apollos, and Cephas are his, for they are Christ's, and Christ is God's. That is the conclusion of the whole matter, beyond which nothing can be said. (vi.) Chapter iv. deals with Paul's account of himself as an apostle and "a minister of Christ, a steward of the mysteries of God." As is God, such man ought to be, a being who subordinates all inferences not to his own reason, but to God's. And Paul identifies himself with Apollos in order that Corinthian men might set no man above the written word. Everything, even apostles, depend on the will of God, and Paul intends to reverse man's dependence on speech, and turn it into a dependence on Divine power. (vii.) The fifth chapter deals with a wicked man. Paul so recognizes the autonomy of the local church as to declare that he is present in spirit and delivers the man to Satan for the destruction of his flesh and the salvation of his spirit. The corrupt man is charged with doing other and worse things than even the heathen are accustomed to boast of. Paul therefore exhorts them thus: "Put away from among yourselves every such wicked person." He himself cannot recommend an act of discipline without enunciating great truths, as when he says: "Purge out the old leaven that ye may be a new lump" (7); "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us" (8); "What have I to do to judge them that are without?" (12). (viii.) But in the sixth chapter is discussed a question which concerns the man who took a brother before a heathen magistrate. He is emphatically condemned. The persons within the church when they went out of it for justice, split the church, which was Christ's. And men who are guilty of evil-doing, sin against that body which is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and which God had bought with a price. Amongst the principles here contained are: "The unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God" (9); "It is better to be defrauded than to defraud" (8); "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient" (12); "The body is for the Lord, and the Lord for the body" (13).

2. The second section extends from vii. to xv. (i.) In chapter vii. there is begun a new theme, which concerns the relation of the sexes among the converted. The question is one which, considering the reputation of the city, could not but emerge in any local assembly, and stands related to one connected with the wicked person discussed in v. The question receives here illuminative treatment, and the chapter became in later centuries a standard for Christian law in relation to marriage and to divorce. Yet, like all special subjects in the hands of Paul, general principles are suggested: "Every man has his proper gift of God" (7); "It is better to marry than to burn" (9); "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife by the husband" (14); "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing," but everything depends on "the keeping of the commandments of God" (19); "Be not

* Gal. iv. 11.

sion of particular facts in the light of general principles.

ye the servants of men" (23); "The time is short" (29); "Use the world as not abusing it" (31). (ii.) Chapter viii. touches on things offered unto idols, and argues that abstinence from meat offered in a heathen temple ought to be a conscious act. If it is knowingly eaten, it becomes an offence against the weak brother and an encroachment on Christian liberty. The chapter contains certain pregnant sayings: "Knowledge puffeth up, love buildeth up" (1); "If any man love God, the same is known of Him" (3); "An idol is nothing in the world" (4); "To us there is only one God" (6); "Meat commendeth us not to God" (8); "When ye wound the weak conscience of the brethren, ye sin against Christ" (12). The whole culminates in the writer's resolution: "I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend" (13). (iii.) Has he then no liberty? This may be said to be the point discussed in ix., which treats of the more generous and general conception of freedom. The history with which the whole chapter is filled is indeed Jewish, but it includes certain characteristic sayings: "As to his power to eat and drink" (4); "to work and forbear working" (6). The law had said, "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn" (9); "God takes care for oxen" (9); "He that ploweth plows in hope" (10); "If we have sown spiritual things, is it a great matter that we reap carnal things?" (11); "Though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all that I might gain some" (19); "They who run in a race, run all; but only one receiveth the prize" (24). (iv.) In chapter x. he passes from the history of the Jews to historical Judaism, and argues that though God was not equally pleased with all, yet all were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. He urges towards the close that no offence should be given to the Jews, to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God that the many may be saved, so he passes from historical Judaism to what concerned him most of all, the church of his own day and the conduct of the people within it. Among the principles he gives utterance to are: "Flee from idolatry" (14); "I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say" (15); "Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy?" (22); "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient" (23); "Ask no question for conscience sake" (25); "Why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?" (30). (v.) In chapter xi., which contains an account of the Eucharist and of Christian worship in Corinth, he insists on the excellence of obedience, but does more than he set out with attempting. For he says that when the Christian people come together it is not for the better, but for the worse. Men seem to think rather of their own things, than of the things of God. Here he gives an account of what is termed in modern times the Eucharist and its celebration, and some important principles are stated: "The head of Christ is God" (3); "Judge in yourselves" (13); "Doth not even nature itself teach you?" (14). (vi.) Chapter xii. is occupied with the

II

Paul came into conflict with two features which marked the city: Exorcism and Religion.*

subject of spiritual gifts, which men are urged to covet earnestly, but in the end he shows us "a more excellent way." Some significant texts may here be quoted: "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit"; "Differences of administration but one Lord, and diversities of operation, but it is one and the same God which worketh all in all" (4-6); "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free" (13); "The body is not one member, but many (14); "The eye cannot say unto the hand I have no need of thee, nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you" (21); "If one member of the body suffer, all the members suffer with it; if one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it" (26). (vii.) xiii. This is a chapter which the late Dean Stanley used to say, had no fellow in the Koran. Its wisdom may be thus represented: "Love suffereth long and is kind, love envieth not, love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up" (4); "Love doth not fail" (8); "We know in part, and we prophesy in part" (9). It ends with "the greatest of these is love" (13). (viii.) Men are advised in chapter xiv. to desire spiritual gifts, but for a higher reason than their proud possession or that men may prophesy. Having defined prophecy he says, "Greater is he that prophesieth than he who speaketh with tongues" (5), and he adds that "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" (32); "There are many kinds of voices in the world, but none of them without signification" (10); "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also" (15); "I thank my God that I speak with tongues more than ye all" (18); "I had rather speak five words with my understanding than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue" (19); "In understanding be not children, but in malice" (20); "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace" (33). The chapter ends with an eminently Pauline verse: "Let all things be done decently and in order" (41). (ix.) Chapter xv. opens by declaring his Gospel is what he himself received, and is made up of three things: (i.) That Christ died for our sins; (ii.) that He rose again; and (iii.) that He did both "according to the Scriptures." Christ, it is argued, in His resurrection so represents as to contain all

* Acts xix. 13-20, 23-41. Ephesus, though well described as "a city of change"—change is an ambiguous word—and in its intellectual sense as a matter of fact Ephesus changed little. It was not unstable, especially in religion, but a convinced worshipper of its great goddess while its goddess remained great and seemed powerful.

1. Exorcism had come very largely into the hands of the Jews,* in whose Synagogue Paul preached for the space of three months.† There, it is said, he disputed with the Jews and persuaded them. In the Synagogue, indeed, some were not persuaded, but hardened, and Paul departed from it, and instead he disputed daily in the school‡ of one Tyrannus. Nor must we think of him as confining himself to Ephesus.§ He did not, for, as a matter of fact, "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, whether

mankind. Hence this corruptible must put on incorruption; this mortal must be clothed with immortality, and the conclusion is reached that all who believe are to be steadfast and unmovable. And the phenomena of memorable sayings which so mark the letter here reappear: "By the grace of God I am what I am" (10); "If Christ be not raised, ye are yet in your sins" (17); "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (22); "He must reign until He hath put all enemies under His feet" (25); "Awake to righteousness and sin not" (34); "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural" (46); "Thanks be unto God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (57),

* It is curious that this should have been true of a race whose religion was the most monotheistic religion then known, but it has other elements than the belief in one God. There was prophecy, and the prophetic office, which was understood in the Jewish schools as involving knowledge of future events. In any system, therefore, that implied such a knowledge, magic was quite possible, and had its own place. It is one, therefore, of the many things that the dogmata of our schools owes to Jewish theology, which we, who conceive the Hebrew prophets similarly, often forget. Yet no man who held office among the Jews encouraged the belief in magic, in exorcism, or in necromancy. It was opposed by all who held dear the belief in one God, who always acted according not only to his own will but to law.

† Acts xix. 8.

‡ He lectured in the school of Tyrannus two years (Acts xix. 9). About Tyrannus we know nothing, and therefore can say nothing with any relevance concerning either him or his school. He may have been a Rhetor, or a person who gave to the school its name, or a person in the locality of whom the school was hired. This ignorance is happily without signification.

§ Acts xix. 10. The "Asia" of the text is not the modern continent, but the Roman province of which Ephesus was capital. The "Jews and Greeks," too, of the text is a euphemism of phrase intended to denote "all peoples."

they were Jews or Greeks." Still, the significant thing is that the spirit of exorcism had entered into certain persons, who are here called "vagabond Jews,"* and they took upon them to pronounce the name of the Lord Jesus over persons possessed of evil spirits, to whom they are said to have addressed the saying, "We adjure you by Jesus, whom Paul preaches, to come out of him," but the seven sons or disciples of Sceva,† who is described as "chief of the priests" in Judaism, tried to do so with signal failure, for the evil spirit answered, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?" Now it is written — the man who had the strength of madness "overcame and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of the house naked and wounded, and this was known to all the Jews and the Greeks who dwelt at Ephesus." The books which taught of curious arts of magic were burned before all men. They counted the price, and found it to be fifty thousand pieces of silver.‡ Paul, in other words, preached the word of God so "mightily" that a purer life and a sweeter society were in consequence established in Ephesus.

2. The second thing that Paul came into conflict with in Ephesus was religion. The religion is called that of Diana, but she is represented in the Anatolian faith by a Bee, and those who ministered unto her were named after the honey they distributed. The Greeks, according to their

* The term "vagabond" occurs three times (Acts xxviii. 13, 1 Tim. v. 13, Heb. xi. 37) in addition to this case in the New Testament, where it always denotes a person or thing that wanders round and round, aimlessly, it may be, but the essential idea is the wandering round and round.

† This Sceva may have belonged to a high priestly family, but he is himself otherwise quite unknown. May I draw attention to the fact that this is no echo of Acts viii. 18–19, because there is nothing corresponding either to the sons, or to the number seven?

‡ Acts xix. 19.

custom, translated the animal into the man, and so changed the symbol into a goddess which corresponded to their own Artemis. They, as was natural, knew her by her Greek name, though she is represented to us by its Latin equivalent. Paul, by his mission, was brought into relationship with this religion, and with those who represented it. Yet they must be distinguished from the men called Asiarchs, who were among the most honourable men of Ephesus, and special friends of Paul. Their consciences did not, like that of so many of their compatriots, live in their pockets, nor were they most pricked when it pinched most severely, though as citizens of Ephesus they may have held their city to be compromised in the matter of religion. As the capital of the province called Asia, it was a centre whence the whole could be reached. As a class its citizens prided themselves equally on their knowledge of religion and of men, and therefore of each other. Paul, indeed, had so preached in the school of Tyrannus that the people not only were converted, but so converted as to become not indeed like the Jews monotheists; but they ceased to believe in polytheism and to buy the silver shrines of Diana, which they justified by saying that they knew better than to offer to the goddess anything she could neither appreciate nor desire. Men, when they found their craft in danger, became, in view of their threatened craft, extremely pious, in a sense desperately religious. They were so for two reasons, that silver was judged no longer necessary to the worship of the goddess, and, with the silver, the workmen also became superfluous.

3. Paul, therefore, in his own graphic words, had to fight "with beasts at Ephesus."* All classes of men, city magnates and magistrates, soldiers and civilians, judges and

* 1 Cor. xv. 32.

lawyers of all kinds, men of letters and of commerce, tradesmen and craftsmen, all sorts and conditions of men who in any form entertained dislike to Paul, met in an irregular assembly, where he was informally tried and condemned. For such men judged that the last impiety was to make a shrine unworthy either the goddess to whom it was presented or the man who presented it; and to be unworthy was to these men to be made neither of silver nor by any cunning workmen. Paul had come to their help as he had gone to Europe to help it, but they received him with suspicion and satire. The men were led by a craftsman called Demetrius, who had assembled his co-workers probably in a craft guild or meeting place. When they met in this their common meeting place, which was strictly guarded, they were quite in order, but in the theatre they became disorderly, for "the major part did not know the cause for which they had been called together." It was easy, therefore, to protest their loyalty to their local religion, which they did by lustily "calling out," which they did for "about the space of two hours," "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." Even here "the Jews" could not be silent, but would speak their hatred. So Alexander was "put forward," "and would have made their defence," but the man who is called the Town Clerk rose in his place and spoke somewhat as follows: "There is no need to put forward any claim on behalf either of our religion or our goddess. To speak of Ephesus is to think of it and of her. We do not need to assert what all men know, and what all men recognize. What, then, are these men you so charge? They are neither robbers of shrines, nor are they blasphemers of Diana, nor are they, like the Jew Alexander, men put forward for racial rather than for any other reasons. If, then, Demetrius have a matter against them, let him act

as becomes a man, and plead at the bar of a law which does not know any difference between rich and poor, ignorant and wise, or Greek and Barbarian; if there is anything else, then over all is a properly constituted assembly, which is one that can be recognized and known. All are in danger from this day's riot, for there is no reason which can be found why it ought to have been; or there is nothing which we can give as a reason for this meeting to those who have a right to know why it has been, and what may be the outcome of it."

III

1. After the uproar had ceased "Paul called unto him the disciples and embraced them, and departed to go into Macedonia."* If he went at this time he may have written while there the second letter to the Corinthians, which proves, among other things, that the Judaizing party in Corinth had grown bolder and more pronounced. For the bulk of the letter is taken up with a contrast between the old and the new economies, which implies a strong party in favour of Moses and his Law, while it also refers to his approaching visit to Corinth as the third.† At a second visit he had therefore carried out his purpose and departed. Then he had Judæa still in mind,‡ but more than Judæa he had the interest of his converts at heart.§ The preaching of the Son of God was to him affirmative, or, to use his own words, it "was not yea and nay, but it was yea."|| Quite a number of things are said by him of a personal order. He refers to himself, to Silas,¶ to Timothy,** and

* Acts xx. 1. † 2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1. ‡ 2 Cor. ix. 1–2.

§ 2 Cor. ii. 2–5; viii. 22–24; xi. 1–2. || 2 Cor. i. 19–20.

¶ 2 Cor. i. 19. It is significant that while Timothy is, Silas is not, associated with him in the superscription to the letter (2 Cor. i. 1). If Silas still lived (cf. Acts xviii. 5) this was opposed to Paul's usual custom and courtesy. Cf. 1 Thess. i. 1 and 2 Thess. i. 1.

** 2 Cor. i. 1. Where the reference is to "Brother Timothy," and 19.

to Titus,* and he compares the two dispensations, and the comparison becomes a contrast. The old is a dispensation of the letter, the new is of the spirit. The letter has power to kill; but the spirit quickeneth. The dispensation of death was written and graven on stone, and was as inflexible as the stone on which it was engraven, but the quickening administration of the spirit was glorious, and had a higher grace, as well as a greater glory. The Lord was like the spirit, and had a glory that excelled. Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; freedom from the law and its bondage. But liberty is more than simple freedom — it is to be free and yet to be bound. And all Christian men so fear that they are "bond slaves of Christ." And great as the Gospel was, certain things were greater — the things of God. Paul did not feel satisfied with anything less than service of man. He felt that to live unto Christ was to live unto God, and he gave a wide interpretation to the act of so living.

Hence the love of Christ, understood as His love to men rather than theirs to Him, is gracious as well as good; and Paul argued that Christian men did not need to mind whether they were reckoned sober or mad. His aim was to seek to persuade men to be reconciled to God, and when they were so reconciled the death of Christ did not fail of its effects. Man was a new creature, and to a new creation the whole world was renewed. Christ saw the fruit of His travail and was satisfied; men became "the righteousness of God" when they lived "in Him." The cause of the supersession of the old economy was the existence of the new.

2. About the same time, or very near it, Paul must also have written the nearest thing to a treatise that came from his hand. This is the Epistle to the Romans, which

* 2 Cor. ii. 13; vii. 6, 13, 14; viii. 6, 16, 23; xii. 18.

is less a letter than a treatise, yet has the qualities inseparable from anything he cared to do. It is elaborate and deals with what lay near his heart — the proof of the new religion, and yet its distinction from the old. It has in Galatians its first outlines. It represents a two-fold division: (i) doctrinal, and (ii) ethical. The doctrinal is also historical; the ethical is practical and hortatory. Paul is too clear and correct a thinker to fall a victim to such an obvious and artificial trick of thought as division. In all his history there is much pure logical intellect; in all the creations of his intellect there is also much history. The two so interpenetrate that the history is but the garment for the thought and the thought inexplicable without the history. In the doctrinal part of the *Romans* we cannot say this is historical and that theological; for our difficulty is due to the fact that there is no distinction between the two. We cannot tell where history ends and where theology begins. The two are so mixed that if we can distinguish between them the creations of the intellect and the forms of history, I would say that eight chapters are taken up with intellectual judgments, three deal with the history which clothes them, and another three with the ethics which are based on the thought and yet have regard to conduct. The chapters which deal with pure intellect are i–viii inclusive. Those concerned with history are ix–xi; while those which relate to conduct are xii-xv, also inclusive. But the distinctions are not involved in the position he occupied as an apostle commissioned to preach the Gospel of God. To speak about God is to praise His character and His action, which is said to consist in Promise and in Law which between them make up the Holy Scriptures. Paul discovered the meaning of the Promise, and he distinguished it from the Law.

The distinction being this: that the Law was what God laid down as duty and imposed on men; and the Promise, that which had been spoken even before the Law. The Gospel is defined as concerning His Son Jesus Christ. To speak of Him is to say that He has been declared the Son of God in possession of power according to the Spirit of Holiness by the Resurrection and the Dead.*

IV.

(i)† The introduction shows three things: (*a*) What Paul understood by his apostleship. The part ends in the salutation to the church at Rome.‡ (*b*) He explains § why he did not carry out his declared intention of visiting Rome.|| All he says, indeed, is that he was "hindered hitherto,"¶ but he expresses his faith and recognizes his duty to communicate what he himself believed to the men who believed with him, or as he himself says, "that he may be comforted in you, each by the faith which lives in the other." And (*c*) he states by the help of a quotation from the Old Testament the doctrine of "the righteousness of God by faith" as he conceived it.** This he understands as that in "the Gospel of Christ" which makes it "the power of God unto salvation." (ii) There is a continuation of the subject which grows directly out of the introduction:†† — the presence in all men of the light from

* The Epistle to the Romans, which too closely resembles a treatise to be like a letter, has little in it that can be described as biographical. This remark is general, and applies to the whole epistle, which can be divided into either two parts or three; in the former case chapters ix. to xi. are included with chapters i. to viii., in the latter case they are excluded. † i.–viii. ‡ 1–17. § 8–13.

|| Acts xix. 21; cf. xxiii. 11; and Rom. xv. 24. ¶ 13.

** Rom. i. 16–17; Hab. ii. 4. The translation is incorrect, but Paul's use of it is justified. †† i. 18–21.

heaven. This light, which does not lead astray, needs to be and is explained as to source and object. The passage needs to be read in connection with the speech at Lystra* and with the address on Mars' Hill.† (iii) There exists no more serious and keen-sighted and often-quoted indictment of Roman morals or immorality than we have here.‡ It is descriptive, and so both historical and intellectual. Nothing in the Epistle to the Romans has more of history behind and within it, and yet more of intellect. (iv) § Three subjects are here discussed: (*α*) He turns and says to an imaginary objector, "Thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, who judgest." The matter of the judgment as well as the form or judge is specified. The man condemns himself who judges another, and Paul gives his specific reason for this, saying, "Thou that judgest doest the same things," and the imaginary objector is asked certain questions.|| (*β*) The questions end in reasons for an order in responsibility and in judgment. There is also drawn out in detail a parallel between the Hebrew or written law and the law which is unwritten, or, as Paul says, "in the heart,"¶ whose unity with the written law is also affirmed. (*γ*) The whole concludes that the work of the law is so written in the heart of man that his consciousness bears witness to its truth, because his thoughts accuse or else excuse each other. Wherever there is difference there must be, in order to agreement, discussion, and wherever there is a judge there is also a law.** (v)†† The mention of the Law brings out a preëminence of the Jew in Paul's estimation: — he could teach all mankind, in particular as regards what had been committed to him, God and His word. He therefore says, "Thou who art called a Jew and who restest

* Acts xiv. 14–17. † xvii. 22–31. ‡ Rom. i. 22–32. § ii. 1–16.
|| ii. 3–11. ¶ ii. 12–14. ** ii. 15–16. †† ii. 17–29.

in the law and makest thy boast of God," and "art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind."* In what follows there is a description of circumcision, where is enunciated the great truth that circumcision profiteth if the Jew keep the whole law, but if he be a breaker instead of an observer of the law he becomes to God as a heathen man; and his circumcision is made uncircumcision. This involves the opposite principle: — the uncircumcised counts as the circumcised, and the principle becomes important in view of the deduction it carries: — that there is no "outward Jew" nor is there any circumcision in the flesh.† (vi) We have to note as to chapter iii (*a*) that one paragraph‡ begins by an account of the Jew and his preëminence in religion, and ends with proof that "Jews and Gentiles" alike "are all under sin." It may be said to have its truth suggested by its opening question, which asks, "What preëminence hath the Jew, and what profit is there in circumcision?" To which only one answer is possible: "Much in every respect, but chiefly in this: — that unto the Jews were committed the oracles — i.e. the Scriptures — of God."§ (*β*)|| We have here an important paragraph, practically the kernel of the treatise, because it contains two main things: an account of the righteousness of God by faith,¶ and of the God who provides both the righteousness and the faith.** This deserves to be called "the kernel of the treatise," for the righteousness and the faith involve two things: (i) an immediate vision of God, (ii) the faith by which He can be reached. The (i) raises the question, "Is He the God of the Jews only, or of the Gentiles also?" The (ii) raises the question what Jesus did, if He did not die for sin, or can

* ii. 17–19. † ii. 25–29. ‡ iii. 1–18. § iii. 1, 2.
|| iii. 19–31. ¶ iii. 19–25. ** iii. 27–31.

God be related to all men unless He be righteous? Hence the conclusion that by the flesh, or anything done through it or in it, no righteousness which He Himself directly provides and approves can be obtained.

2. (vii) In chapter iv Abraham is next discussed, where he is described as the father of many nations, who, according to the promise given him that his seed was to be more numerous than the grains of sand upon the seashore, believes not the words, but the God who spoke them. And is by this faith justified? (viii) In chapter v there are two sections: (*a*)* The first section is important were it only because it is the transition to a new theme which was never far from the apostle's thoughts, the identity of Christ and of man. (*b*) The second section† has, as a consequence of what has gone before, an important parallel between Christ and Adam, where is shown that God has not departed from His usual method in identifying the sinful man with the obedient Christ. He had so identified the disobedient Adam with the Sinless Man as to show that where he sinned his sin was imputed unto men. Hence as sin reigned through Adam unto death, so grace reigned through Christ unto eternal life, which is opposed to the death that came in consequence of Adam's sin. The righteousness of God has, as its consequence, life in the Spirit, as sin has its resultant in physical death. And these two are one. (ix) In the next chapter another question is asked: "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?"‡ To which Paul returns a negative answer, "Let it not be," and appends a reply, "How shall we that are dead to sin live unto God?"§ (x) In the succeeding chapter we have a question of biographical significance.|| The law teaches man the knowledge of sin, yet the man who is dead to the law has in him

* v. 1–11. † v. 12–21. ‡ vi. 1. § vi. 2. || vii. 7, 9–10.

two things, the command to obey and the love of Christ which occasions obedience. Hence he "delights in the law of God after the inward man,"* which is the same thing as obedience. The law, which is outward, came in because of sin, and wars against the law of man's mind, which is inward.† The man is not as the law is, holy, just, and good;‡ he loves the better, but chooses the worse.§ Thus the law,‡ which makes other and happier conditions possible, would be his life were he to allow it; but it becomes his death, and he can only exclaim, "Oh, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"|| Deliverance comes, according to Paul, through Jesus Christ.¶

3. (xi) The viii chapter falls into two divisions: (*a*)** The opposition of the carnal to the spiritual mind, which is love and peace, is emphasized, but only that the spirit may be exhibited as warring against the flesh.†† The man who is spiritual is bound as an "heir of God and joint-heir with Christ" to live according to the spirit;‡‡ and this spirit is exhibited in nature and in man as waiting "for the manifestation of the sons of God" which brings them into a "glorious liberty."§§ Nature may suffer with man, but it so suffers only to share his renewal. The will of God so penetrates all things and persons that wherever it is, in nature as in man, there must be improvement, which means a second birth. (*β*)||| The whole previous section may be said to culminate in his account of the will of God. "All things work together for good to them that love Him." Paul then gives his version of the divine purpose, which relates to those God called — the foreknown or predes-

* vii. 22. † vii. 23. ‡ vii. 12. § vii. 15–17.
|| vii. 24. ¶ viii. 25. ** viii. 1–27. †† viii. 1–10.
‡‡ viii. 11–17. §§ viii. 18–23. ||| viii. 28–39.

tinated are to be — eternity is to God an eternal now — "conformed to the image of His Son, in order that He might be the first-born among many brethren,"* as He with His redeemed around Him form together a family to God. Then the purpose to which Paul had throughout addressed himself is stated:† "He who spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" From that to the end alike of the chapter and section there is a paragraph, — one of the most eloquent in the letters of Paul, — which deals with the highest of all things, the interpretation of God, in which the will of God means the Pauline doctrine of grace.

V

1. In the three chapters that follow there is a theory of God's action in history or His sovereignty which can be explained only as one holds God to be what He is, governed by the laws of His own being. The (i) section ‡ which is concerned with history discusses subjects which may be divided thus: (*a*) The introduction § is transitional: — the survey of Christian privileges fills "the eye and prospect of" the writer's soul, which yet is full of regret for the excluded — a grief the apostle finds it the harder to bear that the excluded are his own "kinsmen" who had in past times received many tokens of the divine favour, which began with their very name and ends only with the descent of the Messiah. (*b*) But neither the promises nor God Himself were so fused with the people as to be inseparable from Israel. The privileges were but temporal, and the election

* viii. 28–30. † viii. 32.

‡ The ix is a famous chapter, were it only because of theological differences which have divided exegetes. § ix. 1–5.

signified no more than the opposite process, the reprobation, whether of Esau or of Pharaoh.* (*c*) Evidence follows from Old Testament prophets, like Hosea and Isaiah, as well as from the nature both of righteousness and the law, that Israel could not attain, by an obedience which was but partial, the things promised to a faith which was universal.† (ii) The section which follows falls into two parts, which discuss (*a*) the meaning of "the righteousness of faith" to which Israel would not submit, and the consequent equality established between Jew and Greek;‡ and (*b*) a faith which leans on the preacher, as the preacher on the people by whom he is sent.§ (iii) The following chapter discusses three subjects: (*a*) the relation of God to Israel;|| (*b*) the relation of Israel to man;¶ and (*c*) the relation of God to mankind;** "God shut up all together in unbelief that He might have mercy upon all."†† This section concludes as in all Paul's great epistles with a doxology touching "the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God."‡‡ It ends thus: "Of Him, through Him, and to Him are all things, to Him be glory for ever, Amen."§§

2. There is also formulated a practical purpose, and there is in consequence much exhortation to realize it. The section|| || is occupied with ethics. (i) One never reads Paul without a sense of his fitness for his office, which represented God among men. Whether the things concern man's beliefs or conduct, he speaks always as a man appointed of God, and as a person whose place is worthily gained. His system of ethics is formed indeed out of his theology; but his theology is strictly natural. The Creator is to him the maker

* ix. 6–23. † ix. 24–33. ‡ x. 1–12. § x. 13–21.
|| xi. 1–10. ¶ xi. 11–20. ** xi. 21–31. †† xi. 32.
‡‡ xi. 33. §§ xi. 36. || || It extends from xii to xv.

of all we see, and his ethics and his theology are, as embedded in nature, alike natural. (ii) The relation between the theology and the ethics becomes apparent by the very opening of the section, where men are besought to present themselves unto God as a living sacrifice.* Men are required to think of themselves "according to the measure of faith," and instead of looking back to look before, and Paul explains what he means. He refers to mankind as a whole, and the new man is meant to be "in Christ" and, as he says, "every one members one of another." On this basis a system of ethics is built as new as his theology. (iii) In the xii and xiii chapters a principle is implied which takes for granted man's reason and his being in a political system, which, as well as man's place in it, has been determined by the will of God, who also has fixed man's destiny. And Paul expresses his belief that "love is the fulfilling of the law."† (iv) In the chapters that follow he explains the weakness of "the weak brother," and exhorts the "strong to bear the infirmities of the weak."‡ It is the duty of the Christian man to "please his neighbour for his good." The treatise ends in a doxology: — "the God of peace be with you all." These are the final words in a treatise which contains more thought than even Paul was in the habit of communicating.

VI

1. The range and the materials of Christian thought and its consequent system of obligation stand embodied in the treatise which has just been described, and I know nothing that states more clearly what a Christian man ought to believe, to be, and to do. We may think, though it

* xii. 1. † xiii. 10. ‡ xiv. 1; xv. 1.

is a curious thing even to imagine it as a possibility, that the letter may have fallen, on its way to Rome, into the hands of Gallio. Yet, especially if we consider the position he occupied, there is nothing to surprise us in it so falling. He had, like his own brother, the philosopher Seneca, literary ambition which in Achaia, with clever and intellectual Greeks all round him, he had every opportunity for indulging. He opens, therefore, the letter which, as it were by accident, has fallen into his hands, and reads it. He knew the Romans, and he felt their scorn for the conquered, whether clever or the opposite. The fact that a man has been conquered, makes him even to his conqueror hardly a man. And Gallio had this feeling to the Jew. But we have imagined this Pauline letter "to the Romans" as having chanced to come into his hands, and we can therefore overhear comments which he utters on the opened letter. "Paul?" he says, "that was the little 'blear-eyed' Jew-man they brought before my judgment-seat, against whom I would not hear any charge, and I was a wise man for it. For this Paul was a man that had in his thinking clearly defined the difference between a religion protected by the State, and the State which protected the religion. I am not now, as I was not then, prepared to recognize the teaching of religion as the function of the State." But he reads on: "Paul a servant of Jesus Christ." "Jesus Christ?" Why, who is that? He must be the person whom I have heard my friend, Pontius Pilate, talk about — a man whom the obstinate, credulous Jews persecuted unto death by pestering Pilate into crucifying. And after they had caused him to be crucified at Jerusalem, here is this Paul addressing him as the Son of God, which is, to say the least, unusual on the lips of a Jew, who is a man that believes in one God. I would like to have

heard my brother Seneca, though he was younger than myself, speak on the extravagances of the human mind in the matter of belief, for they are past comprehension by me. Even this Paul confesses himself an apostle — i.e. a man sent out and delegated by him who sends him, — of the Son of the Most High God." But he reads on and finds that Paul speaks of himself as "debtor, both to the Greek and to the Barbarian, to the ignorant and to the wise," and Gallio adds, "If any man imagines he can catch Paul napping, then he is a most enviable person and one qualified to teach himself what to do and what to think about the case." He reads on, and finds that the righteousness of God is called in this letter "to the Romans" good news; and the introduction ended, its author comes to a description of the Roman world: its sin, its vice, its passion, its bestial lust. And Gallio says, "This man, at least, has in him an eye which can see, and which looks straight into the sins of our time." Then Gallio continues to read till Paul comes to speak about a law of God in the heart. "Why," he says to himself, "my brother, philosopher though he is, never said anything as true as this. A law in the heart? it accuses, perfectly right, Paul, and it excuses, perfectly right still, and this accusing and excusing proves that we have moral standards of judgment. Right," saith Gallio, "there is such a source of obligation which proves Jew and Greek to have moral standards of judgment. The man who can teach this has much to say that the Greek ought to hear, and the Latin as well." But Gallio reads on. He reads of "the righteousness of God," of a God who is righteous, "of Grace," and the God who is gracious; of man, who is altogether evil, incorporated in one head named Adam, who lives according to the flesh; but his works are undone in another Head,

named Christ, who lives according to the spirit, and he says: "Thou art right here also, O Paul, judged according to this standard, for all men are either in the Adam when they act according to the flesh, or in the Christ when they act according to the spirit." On this marvellous letter, therefore, Gallio moralizes thus: "Why, I never did a greater or better day's work in my life than when I refused to imprison Paul or even to keep him in bonds, preferring that he should be free." The man who may have said so much for Paul and his belief in him deserved better of the church than to be made a type of those who care for "none of these things."

2. Paul has lived ever since in spirit, transforming men into vehicles of Christian thought, and Christian belief, and Christian character, massing them together so as to form a Christian society, making the whole history of mankind everywhere an expression of the infinite will of God. There is a great difference between the egotism of vocation and the egotism of vanity. Many men are possessed of the egotism of vanity, for it makes a man intensely self-important and communicative, especially in trivialities, like questions of dress, as when he says, "I saw yesterday a gentleman, who was dressed in a given way; and he said to me so-and-so." The questions that the egotism of vanity loves to discuss are: "The way in which I bore myself in a certain society, and the way in which the society bore itself to me." It is small and common; but the egotism of vocation is neither small nor common. It does not know an ego, but loses itself in God; it simply makes self into a vehicle or vessel for God, and there is no being for it other than His will. Paul had no single element of the egotism of vanity, though he had a large share of the egotism of vocation.

VII

1. But in the late days of his life, worn out and weary, Paul took a great longing to go back to Jerusalem and join in the worship of his fathers' God. I know the longing, and have experienced it, having lived much from home. In the fiords of Norway I have lain and yearned, with a consuming desire, for the long bare ridge of the Lammermoors, and for its bent grass which waves in the wind. I have stood, too, by Niagara, but I could not hear the roar of its mighty waters or see the beauty of their colour for thoughts of the silvery Tweed. I have lived under the shadow of the Himalayas, and have looked on our highest mountain range, whose glories I have been quite unfit to see because the sound of the voice I first knew and most loved was in my ears. I have sung with many an ancient person the Psalms of my people —

> In Judah's land God is well known,
> His name in Israel's great;
> In Salem is His tabernacle,
> In Zion is His seat.

Yes, I have loved the Psalms the people sang, because I have loved the people that sing the Psalms, and know by personal experience how a man feels who loves to worship with his kin. In his age and feebleness, battered and spent, driven by inexorable longing up to Jerusalem to dwell among his own kin, Paul would worship the God of his fathers upon the hill of Zion, which was to him a mount of vision. How then did he go? Did Ephesus attract him? He might be accompanied by many men: Sopater from Berœa,* or Aristarchus and Secundus from

* Acts xx. 4; cf. Rom. xvi. 21.

Thessalonica,* Gaius from Derbe,† Timotheus from Lystra,‡ Tychicus and Trophimus from the province of Asia;§ but converts could not satisfy a man moved by love of home. He sailed away from Philippi, whence he came unto Troas, from which he first visited the land of Europe, and where came to him the dream which was the vision of his life. But Ephesus could not detain him, and therefore he did not spend the time on land, but "he hasted if it were possible for him to be at Jerusalem by Pentecost."|| But while he could not call at Ephesus, he went as near it as was possible, and "sent and called the elders of the church there to Miletus."¶ He sailed past it, therefore, and reached Tyre, where disciples met him, and said that he should not go amongst his own people.** Wives and children might together bring him on his way, but whilst all knelt down on the shore and prayed, the hour came of leave-taking. Time and tide will wait for no man, and so they of Paul's company took ship, and wives and children returned to their homes again. But from Tyre they went to Cæsarea, where, in the house of Philip the Evangelist, whose daughters were prophetesses, we read that "a certain prophet named Agabus"†† came from Jerusalem and said, "You will be bound in bonds, therefore stay your feet, and let them not move towards Jerusalem; do not seek to stand within it." And the prophet in so saying said but what he knew.

2. A man who loves men cannot understand or appreciate their hate. A man of large enthusiasm cannot know a narrower man, a fanatic who measures everything by a sect or a tribe. Paul, who carried with him his treasured collec-

* Acts xx. 4.
† Acts xx. 4; cf. 1 Cor. 1, 14; Rom. xvi. 23.
‡ Acts xvi. 1–3.
§ Acts xx. 4.
|| Acts xx. 16.
¶ Acts xx. 17.
** Acts xxi. 4.
†† Acts xxi. 10; cf. Acts xi. 27–28.

tion,* and did not know what he went to, passed on his way and in amongst his own people. And what did the people do to him? He was the greatest of missionaries, the man called of God to Europe, who returned from Europe, which he had unified by means of a religion, with it as his field and his fee. And James met him. Now who was James? He is called "the brother of the Lord."† He lived face to face with the Lord for years, but he never knew Him as his Lord and Saviour. He remained an inmate of the same house, yet he did not become either a disciple or an apostle. This man, then, though he never knew the Lord while He lived, has yet his place in His church, in which he holds high office by virtue of his kinship. No doubt he had undergone his measure of conversion, but conversion differs according to the nature of the converted, and this man's nature was not roomy enough to allow him to change his mind; but in spite of everything he yet stands honoured by all at the head of the local church in Jerusalem. This is the man Paul met; and we have but to think of their meeting to see how unlike the men are. James is the head of a comfortable society, a respected man, a man enshrined in respectability, with respectable men about him. He holds the law in honour, and is honoured by the persons who obey it. And Paul, worn, emaciated, with the burden of labour upon him, and equally the burden of years — he has proved himself a great minister of God, who had done much to make God respected even by men who did not respect Him.

3. Now, does James fall before this Paul and say: "I am not worthy to loose your very shoe latchets. You have made the name of our Master illustrious where men live, while I have been staying at home making my own good name, which I have loved,

* 1 Cor. xvi. 1–4. † Gal. i. 19.

neglecting much meanwhile"? Does he say anything approaching that? No, not he; nor does he say anything like it. Instead he says, "You are a suspected man, and you must purge yourself of the suspicion in which you are justly held." For every man gets his deserts. He held, therefore, as a self-evident truth that a suspected man is a man worthy of suspicion. And in the present case he takes a practical step to erase suspicion from minds which doubted this preëminently orthodox person, whom they yet assumed to be heterodox. And he was as heretical as he seemed. He said, therefore: "No man can prevent the people meeting when they hear you have come. But take four men who have a vow on them, purify yourself with them, shave your head, and make all men know that their suspicions are vain and due solely to misinformation. Go with these men into the temple, and show by your action that you walk orderly, and that you and your Gentiles respect the law as I have decreed." It mattered not that Paul came back to Jerusalem with Christianity planted in the Greek mind, and the Greek mind wedded to its wide and universal truths; with the new religion planted in commerce, to grow with it, to purify it, to use it as its own great instrument. He may have replied: "So be it; if my mind, my words, my service, my character, the years of work in the Christian religion, do not satisfy men as they have satisfied God, then I will do as you bid; I will go burn the hair that I have shaven off my head that it may erase the suspicion which men entertain of me." Now, which man is the nobler? The man who thought that the suspicion of his people condemned the suspected, or the suspected man who went in bravely to do the little thing required of him, though the little thing sorely troubled his conscience? While there is no evidence that Paul either

loved to do the thing or loved the thing he did, he still did it in order that he might carry out his own principle, which bade him do nothing that would cause his weak brother to offend. It was a useless step to try to conciliate the men of Israel, and none knew its uselessness so well as he. He was charged with bringing into the temple the polluting presence of Greeks. And they bound him with chains. So "the Jews of Jerusalem" behaved very much as the men of Ephesus behaved, when some cried one thing, and some another.

Paul never scrupled to confess himself a Jew, though he claimed to be "a citizen of no mean city,"* and he addressed the people in Aramaic, which was then the common speech in Palestine.† They heard so much of his speech, but when it became a recital of his conversion and what followed thereon they said, "Away with such a one from the earth; it is not fit that he should live."‡ They bound Paul with thongs, and he said to the centurion, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman?" because as untried he was uncondemned.§ The centurion heard the saying, and was awed by it. Seeking "the chief captain," he told him, "Take heed what thou doest, for this man is a Roman"; and he made answer to the incriminated man, "With a great sum did I obtain this freedom." Paul simply replied, "I was free born."||

I do not know that it is possible to say more touching his imprisonment and later career than is done by the author of the Acts. He moves most freely where the scene allows his Greek spirit free course, which has freest play in the closing scenes, and where Felix, Festus, King Agrippa, are, as officials of Rome, well known in history. They are,

* Acts xxi. 39. † xxi. 40. ‡ xxii. 22.
§ xxii. 25. || xxii. 26–28.

too, the kind of men a writer who was writing fiction rather than fact would most avoid. If the author of the narrative which we name "The Acts of the Apostles" has as the true cause of his speech the Greek spirit, we can readily explain the appearance of names of Roman officials in his narrative. But it is not possible that another man should so write. We learn enough when it is said that Paul was conveyed from Jerusalem to Cæsarea, and thence to Rome, where it is said he dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all who came in unto him.* To this period belong the epistles that are known as "epistles of the captivity": Colossians, Ephesians, Philemon, and Philippians.

(i) Of these Philippians seems to me to be the earlier, inasmuch as it looks back as well as before. Amongst its back references some refer not only to Philippi, but to the ideas expounded in the greater epistles. Amongst the references to Philippi must be reckoned his knowledge of the persons about to receive the epistle,† the men who preached now in truth and now in pretence, his brethren in the Lord, and their conversation, Timothy,‡ and the mission of Epaphroditus.§ The references to their and his past show that he has not in any respect forgotten their goodness to himself,|| and their belief in his teaching as regards righteousness and law and faith.¶

There is also reference to the future which seems most evident.**

(ii) Ephesians, which has been disallowed as an epistle of Paul, as far as I can see without reason or warrant. There is reason why Tychicus only should be alluded to, and also why the doctrine of the church should

* Acts xxviii. 30; cf. 16.
† Phil. i. 3–6, 15–19; ii. 15.
‡ ii. 19.
§ ii. 25; iii. 18.
|| iii. 2–6.
¶ iii. 8–10.
** iv. 8.

be less local and more developed than in any of Paul's earlier epistles.

(iii) Colossians has also to be taken into account, and with it falls or stands Philemon, which is a fine example of courtesy amid difficulties. It has to do with a runaway slave termed Onesimus, and at the same time with Paul, who calls himself "Paul the aged," though he was not an old man according to our reckoning.

What Paul termed specifically his "Gospel" need not here be discussed. His great contribution to thought was a doctrine of the Divine will, construed as the love of Deity to man. The idea of grace was as essentially Pauline as that of love was essentially Johannine; the one took His "love" as an attribute of will, the other took it as an attribute of heart. But the will of Paul was as broad as the heart of John; and the will as more reasonable was more rational than the heart, and also more prepared to accept obedience as inner and not simply sensuous and outer.

X

JOHN THE APOSTLE

I

1. JOHN the Apostle has already been described.* The sketch, indeed, was based avowedly and almost solely upon the information supplied in the Synoptic Gospels, and was not prejudiced in favour of the traditional view.

There must in consequence be an attempt to outline the John of tradition and of theology, and we can best begin with a comparison between the two great writers whose personalities are reflected in the New Testament, Paul and John. This has the double advantage of combining (*α*) the present with the previous "study," and (*β*) two persons who in literature stand together in a preëminence too friendly to admit of rivalry, yet too complementary to permit of independence. For each in his own order is supreme, but the two orders are altogether different. To me there are times when Paul seems the greater, but these are followed by other times when the greatness belongs rather to John. Yet between the men the categories of less and of greater have no place. They differ in kind rather than in degree; but where the qualities are not the same, comparison may yet illustrate differences of feature rather than of scale, whether of moral excellence or defect.

* *Supra*, pp. 302–4.

2. If we take the literature that bears their respective names, then, we find that Paul's letters are full of a personality active, indefatigable, intellectual, critical, strenuous, resolute, aggressive. Man could not quench the energy within him, nor could the majesty of human authority overawe him; he must write as he must speak, travel, evangelize, and teach. He fears no one, spares no one. The rebuke leaps with evil speed to pen or tongue; and the suddenness is equally true of the benediction. He recognizes no responsibility to any man or body of men, only to Christ, who directly made him an apostle. And of himself see how much can be known out of his writings; — we know of his stature, of his appearance, of how his appearance was judged, of his speech, of the stripes he received, the imprisonment he had suffered, the shipwrecks he had endured, the journeys he had undertaken, the men he had met, and the churches he had founded.* We know the men that troubled and the men that edified, the questions, the parties and policies of his time; what was the gospel he preached, and what was proposed as a substitute. We know, too, the internal discipline, and the external relations of the churches: how Jew differed from Gentile, and Gentile from Jew, how together they recognized a common calling, and had a common sanctity with the saints of Greece, who yet rejoiced to help the poor saints at Jerusalem. Paul can be known from his own letters, though he speaks as one who does not mean his personality to stand out prominently, or to be singular in any respect; but he writes simply, and all the more that it is without conscious design the writing expresses his character.

* If we would know how much concerning Paul can be gathered from his letters, we have but to consult 2 Cor. xi; Phil. iii. 1–7; and Rom. i. 8–16; ix. 1–5.

3. Now in the epistles and in the gospel we owe to John there is nothing similar; indeed there emerges an entirely different character, a man totally unlike Paul. We hear his voice, but do not see either the speaker or the persons addressed. We do not know for certain when or how he lived, whether his mother-speech was or was not some form of Aramaic; what friends he had, what labours he endured, what sufferings or what persecutions he underwent. All seems impersonal, though within that very impersonality there appears the most subtly and delicately etched character. He is simply in the background, but the person he means to represent stands in the front, and fills all the scene. Paul so writes his thoughts as to write history, while John so wrote history as to write his thoughts. The history of Paul is a kind of impersonation of will, and at his power we marvel much. John finds in the history of Christ his impersonation; the meaning of the Master is nowhere more comprehensively stated than by the disciple whom He loved, and who so saw Him that He compelled after ages to see as he did, to believe as he believed, and to live possessed of the passion to love as he loved.

II

1. This comparison with Paul compels us to put alongside it another, which may be a comparison with Peter. Here, too, tradition must be followed; but the Petrine tradition does not see what John sees. Had he so seen, Peter could not have resisted writing as to the character of Him he served and loved. He is happier as a companion to John than even Paul and Timothy, for he stands beside him in evangelical history. The two men rise together into fame, and they never ceased to be like each other. Both

were fishermen, and both had to work for their living; but while John rose to a higher level of being, Peter remained what he had been — a worker, with the mind of a workman — slow of thought, though swift of speech, meddlesome yet irrepressible, ready to question and to rebuke the Master. But John, intense in thought, though restrained in speech, — silent, reflective, meditative, intuitive, — holds what he looks at before the eye of his soul till he has absorbed it into his soul's substance. And so, when his object is Jesus, he becomes love from looking at love.

And then observe how love holds him like a spell, defining with almost the rigour of physical law the orbit within which he moves. Peter, at the arrest in Gethsemane, having relieved his feeling by executing vengeance on the servant of the high priest, follows Jesus; but only to be tempted, at the moment when confidence and confession were most needed, into despondency and denial. Yet even then he who had never protested his faithfulness stood by the power of his love. When the disciples who had followed had fled, John, faithful unto death, and obedient through love, stood among the women at the cross. There he received from the Master the charge of His mother, and he took the mother to his own home. And in the home he still reflected on the Son, and, through much meditation on His love for His mother and the mother's love for her Son, he came to know the eternal in the Son and the essential in the Father who sent Him.

2. And when the day of work had come and the apostles had become evangelists, Peter stood out as the preacher and the founder of churches, ever flaming, as it seemed, on the forefront of the morning sky; while John, in all the active and actual things of the church, stood behind Peter, and in his shadow, like one who hardly felt the world to be real,

and who found his only reality in the history that lay behind him and in the visions that floated before. He could not part with the history, for was it not the record of his real experience with the Christ who dwelt in his heart and on whose bosom he had leaned? Yet the history that lived to memory gave form and substance to hope, for he wedded the Jesus that had been to the heaven that was to be. If eternity was to be as the moment when he leaned on the Master's breast at supper, then only a moment could eternity be. And so the heaven before was peopled and realized and defined into real and bodily being by the history which was behind. And thus there came to stand before him in clear and holy vision a moment of human existence which, while it floated between the eternal past and the eternal future, yet held within it all the issues of the one and all the promise of the other. And so we may say that out of holy love came quiet meditation, and out of meditation and love came the History which showed (i) the only-begotten Son as He, in one and the same act, revealed the invisible Father and redeemed the world, and (ii) the Book which we name the Apocalypse, and which, underneath all its visions and mysteries, has ever been showing to the church at once the drama of time and the beatitude of eternity.

III

1. The Master had need of John, as well as John of the Master. The John Jesus made He needed, and the making was a confession of the need. It may seem extraordinary and even extravagant to speak of the Saviour of the world as standing in need of any person, least of all of a man as His special and peculiar friend, but the need was real and two-fold: (*a*) as a friend, (*b*) as interpreter. The two are

so related that he could be interpreter only as he was friend. As friend he loved and therefore needed a person he could love. And Jesus knew that John with all his human frailties was as frail as His hands were strong. So at His touch the narrow heart broadens out into the home of a holy and of a divine benevolence. The Christ so loved as to breathe His own love into John, and with it came life. He held him fascinated till he absorbed His very spirit, and was assimilated to His image. In these gracious hands the man was so held as to be re-formed or made a new creature; and we can see the wondrous charm of the Maker working upon him, making him silent, contemplative, imitative.

2. Can a friendless life even to the Perfect be humanly real yet a really historical life? Without a personal and close friendship could Jesus be said to have known man? He knew, indeed, man's hate: He tasted his fickleness, his treachery, his enmity, though disguised now as patronage and now as jealousy for order or love of law. And He knew the fury of the sin that became at the sight of holiness a passion to stain and to tarnish. Hate waited for His coming into the world, and gathered round Him even at the threshold of His ministry. It grew as grows the thundercloud in the face of the sun, hiding the glory it cannot extinguish. It closed round Him at His death, which it dipped, as it were, "in the hues of earthquake and eclipse." There was no need to cultivate or to direct the forces of sin, which came unbidden and acted according to their nature and as they listed. But human love was too shy and tender a thing to come unbidden. It had to be created, cultivated, won. Yet without human love how could Jesus have known humanity, or experienced all that man can be and ought to be to man?

Without a special friendship how could His strength have

ever known the transcendent joy of feeling round it the clinging arms of a trustfulness that will not let it go? Do not all remember that wondrous prophetic word: "A little child shall lead them"? In a tale, which is well within the memory of all, were it only for its rare and delicate truthfulness, we read of a man into whose lowly life treachery and villainy had come so as to sour his simple piety and to turn him into a sordid hater of his kind. Where love of man had been there came love of gold; and he gathered it and hoarded it, and gloated over his hoard. One day, as he went to his usual shrine to worship, he found the gold gone, and in its place there had come a little helpless child. And round the heart of him a new love, rooted in the innocence and trustfulness of the child, grew and clustered, and the new object made the new love finer, gentler, stronger than the old: it held him: it softened him: it filled him with the milk of human kindness. It was the little child leading the sordid hater of his kind back into a new and generous manhood. And so we may say of Jesus, that He knew in the might of His own experience what it was to redeem man, to see visibly before Him what it was to be redeemed, and to live with the man He peculiarly loved, and found peculiarly loving. What, indeed, was the beloved disciple but a form under which the Redeemer experienced on earth the glory which He should taste with the redeemed in heaven? And may we not say, then, that through this peculiar friendship, Jesus, even in the hour of His passion, knew and realized "the joy that was set before Him"?

3. And this friendship was the condition of interpretation. And surely, for His function and mission in the world, a true interpreter was what Jesus needed most of all. Now, who can interpret love better than the loved?

And it is exactly this quality which distinguishes the interpretation of John. He is most truly called John the Divine, for he was made the Divine, preëminent as such among the apostles, by his heart. Now, his interpretation regarded three provinces, the eternal past behind him, and the eternal future before him, and the moment of history which floated, as it were, between.

(i) That eternal past he changed from a vacant abstraction into the life of a God whose nature is love. We do not think of God in the manner of Isaiah, simply as the lofty One who inhabiteth eternity, or, like the Jewish psalmist, as Him from whose besetting presence we cannot flee. We do not, when the heart is smitten, think of Him, to speak in the language of the schools, as the Infinite or the Absolute or the Unknown; rather we forget the Creator and think of the God we have learned to know from John, the God whose name is Father and whose being is Love.

(ii) Then there is the eternal future. John saw it in apocalyptic visions, and it was very different from the past which he had conceived. When he looked through Christ at the past he saw that in the beginning there was God, and that God was not alone, for even then He was Father. And to be the Father He could not be without the Son. All that past is summed up and represented to him by the idea of a God who ever lives and loves. But when he turns to the future, the vision he has is of this same God as the Centre of a celestial society. Eternity has, as it were, blossomed into heaven, which differs from eternity thus: eternity has none but God in it; but heaven has God and man, though man turned into a society of the good and the holy. Heaven, therefore, is but the memory of the history that lies behind turned into a dream of the infinite beatitude that is before. In this heaven there is

a Lamb upon the throne — and round it are the spirits of just men made perfect, who constitute a society whose life is even as the life of God, one of immortal love.

(iii) And between these two eternities stands the moment of human history which is summed up in Christ, the Incarnate Son, the Fruit of the Eternal Love, the Pledge and Promise of final beatitude. And consider how he conceives this Christ of history. Think how hard the problem he had to solve, viz. to write a human history which was yet truly divine, to describe how the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and yet was bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, and spirit of our spirit. He had to wed the most miraculous of all ideas to the most real and simple of all histories.

IV

1. And this transcendent task, — soberly considered, it was a far harder task than was essayed by Paul in the Letters that attempted the interpretation of Christ's person and significance, — was performed by a man. Leave it to one who had not known and loved the historical Jesus, and the person would have been abnormal, an awful and impossible monstrosity, with His humanity, even as some later theologies conceived it, abolished by the Deity, or, at best, reduced to the semblance of a dream. But in John's Gospel, even more than in any other we possess, the beautiful humanity is retained. To him we owe the finely touched interview with Nathanael; the wedding at Cana of Galilee, with the significant contributions of Jesus to its simple human gladness. Then he shows Him, not standing upon His recognized dignity even as a Rabbi, but graciously receiving a shy and shamed visitor by night; and soon after we find Him sitting, wearied, by

Jacob's well, speaking to the Samaritan woman, and making her at once penitent and happy by His speech. His, too, is the beautiful idyll of the sisters, Martha and Mary, their love to each other and to their brother, and their different but equally real love to Him; He moves through their sorrow like a healing Spirit, comforting by the sympathy He feels, and enriching their happiness by His tender joy. Nor do I hesitate to say, with Renan, that the history of the Passion becomes intelligible so soon as the Fourth Gospel is introduced; that without it the supreme tragedy of time has no reason for its being; but the moment its voice is heard as the voice of truth, all is simple and all clear. And John's is the pen which describes the scene at the cross, where the Son, in the hour of His agony and death, does not forget His mother or the duty He owed to her. And "the disciple whom Jesus loved" proves the essential womanliness of his nature by attracting Mary and by ministering unto her the comfort she so sorely needs. And his is the hand which describes the scene in the garden where Mary the Magdalene and Jesus meet in the wondrous moment of revelation and recognition. These are but a few examples of the vivid delicacy with which John touches, as no other evangelist, the great Central Figure of his history with the lineaments of humanity, the Christ whom he had introduced as the only-begotten of the Father, descended to dwell as His visible glory among men. In His person, the sight and vision, the experience of the temporal and the dream of the eternal are fused into unity; the man is realized in the God, while the God is manifested in the man.

2. Multitudes are akin to John in the tender and meditative, the reverent and contemplative spirit which loves to move round the Master, and will not let Him go till His

mystic meaning be read, without being of his kin in the daring speculative mind which will not love till it has construed His Person. Yet both qualities are found united in John; and also in those beautiful and pious souls which form the constellation that surrounds and accompanies the apostle of love, reflecting his light. That constellation is made up of stars too innumerable for any man to resolve; but among them walk, in radiant beauty, some of the rarest spirits the church has known. Origen, the most learned and the boldest of the fathers, leaves the active ecclesiastics of his time to lead the people and to smite the public eye, while he, dwelling with his scholars and amid his books, seeks that he may find the truth which made the Light of the world its Life and its Love. Bernard, saint and reformer of the Middle Ages, sees his way through their darkness and corruption by the light which comes to a soul that loves, and so lives within the bosom of the Master as to feel its own being lost in His. Tauler, made by mystic contemplation to see that only by escape from himself could he save himself, was taught by John that the only sure way to this end was so to throw round the neck of God the right arm of love and the left arm of humility that he could not but be happy, for wherever he went God would go with him. And like unto him is Madame Guyon, so possessed of the passion for disinterested love, that to her the only possible beatitude is to be so absorbed in the love of God as to be made totally oblivious of self; she felt how the tremulous limitations of a self-regarding love vanished in the presence of the God who is all in all. These, and such like, belong to the goodly fellowship surrounding the beloved disciple, and live by cultivating his spirit and rejoicing in his light.

V

1. This mystic soul or spirit gives to each divine who is like John the distinctive position which defines his work, determines his thought, and the quality of his reverent yet exalted piety. It makes his spirit sensitive to the very shadow of evil, averse to all methods and all actions that do not love the light; it makes him shrink from irreverence or profanity, or impurity, or worldliness, however delicately disguised; and, as a scholar and theologian, it gives him his peculiar insight into the Gospel. The mystic soul has everywhere this quality: it finds in the things of the senses the images and symbols of the spirit. For sense is but a window through which comes in the light, and the object of sense is but a shadow cast by some substantial and eternal thing. Its conscious symbolism is but a garment which veils the very ways and the very truth of God; yet veils them only that they might be the more completely revealed. To read the symbols is to lift the veil and see into a world supernal and divine.

In the Apocalypse we have a conscious and designed symbolism; in the Gospel we have a history which is from its very nature and purpose symbolical. This symbolism is not created by the writer, but was necessary to the history, which was too immense in its meaning and its issues to be exhausted by any events that lived and moved within the realm of the senses. For how can we conceive an incarnation of Christ as other than symbolical in the very proportion that it is real? If God is manifest in the flesh, does it not mean that He is accomplishing infinite things in the form of finitude, things the eye cannot see, or hand handle, or ear hear, which lie above and behind, within and before

the form assumed? And what does this mean, but that the history of the incarnate Person must be a symbol while He has a history?

And so to John the very Person of Jesus was steeped in symbolism. As the Word made flesh, He was the true Shekinah, the visible image of the eternal glory. He was the true Priest, the Temple, the Sacrifice, the Lamb, which bears the sin of the world. Men could eat His flesh, and drink His blood, and those who did had life within them. He was the Light of the world, and its Life; its Resurrection and its Judge; the Good Shepherd, and the True Vine. In Him stood revealed the past life, the present action, and the future purpose of God. Hence what He did, and what was done to Him, took on the like symbolic meaning with His person, yet all remained only the more real. So the history is made to exhibit a two-fold process: (*α*) the action of God against sin, and (*β*) the action of sin against God. The mercy that had stooped to save was mocked and rejected by the very sin that had appealed to it, and moved it to help. And, in the Jews, the official but faithless heads of the chosen people, sin stood incarnate over against the incarnate Deity, erected His cross, offered Him in sacrifice. So were disclosed in one and the same act the might of sin and the sovereignty of grace.

2. But now we must remark how little we can allow even this divine history, with all its symbolic sense, to be abolished and to satisfy us. We cannot part with the historical Jesus Christ; but then the historical is incomplete without the heavenly, of whom history had prophesied. The fulness of Christ was not exhausted in His public ministry, or in the Gospel as history. Nay, rather the Gospel ended in a promise and an expectation; showed the Lord lost to sight that He might begin to live to faith by His session at the right

hand of the Father. And so we may say that we are, by a truly Johannine love of the personal Saviour, carried onwards to his vision of the ascended and the living Christ. Hence came the emphasis it is necessary to lay upon the resurrection. But it must be made at once more spiritual and more real than it has been. The resurrection has, as its antecedent, the death, but not in the death alone had the life culminated, but rather in the resurrection; and even this was but the prelude to the ascension and the exaltation. And the Ascended lived to continue and complete the work which had been begun in the days of the humiliation. His work involved a priesthood, which was eternal, but a priesthood without the priest. And so the Apocalypse came back and took its place as a continuation, in a sense, of the Gospel. While the one bade you look backward, the other bids you look before. The Gospel ends with the ascension, but the Apocalypse begins with the vision of the Ascended, and opens out into the marvellous succession of scenes which show all the sons of God around Him, and made one through the Lamb. And it is our duty to see the unity of the historical and the apocalyptical, the infinite Spirit in the history, the imperishable history in the vision, and the Divine reality of the whole.

3. John loved the church, and therefore its Head. His love of the church was, in a sense, jealousy for her Founder. He could not bear to see the white garments of the Bride soiled, for they must be beautiful and radiant in honour of the heavenly Bridegroom. For His sake the church in her outward being and form, as well as in her inner being and spirit, must be loved. We believe that while the priesthood of the Head is eternal in the heavens, the priesthood of the church, which is His body, is exercised on earth: each is a counterpart of the other, and both are necessary to the

complete saving of man. And as the heavenly Priest was sinless, the priesthood of earth could be fitly fulfilled only by a church without spot or blemish. And as John so conceived the church, he held the liberty and the opportunity of service to be its highest honour. He ever bore himself as one who had been called into it by Jesus Christ, and was responsible to Him who had called him. This sense of honour was finely balanced by the sense of duty, which was expressed in the meekness yet dignity of his spirit, in the constancy and completeness of his devotion. The vastness of the sea and the calm of the clear heaven which lay round him in Patmos seemed slowly to work themselves into the imagination, yet not in their visible, but in their invisible, form, and gradually there unfolded the dream which was the comfort of his mind. From our troubled attempts at realizing the church, from the hindrances that stood in the way of the happier and holier times, John turned to what was the familiar contemplation of his spirit, the church as it lived to its Head, the church as the home of the Spirit, which, ever indwelling in the whole, attracted, held together, and inspired all its parts. The thought that what so perplexed and troubled man was the concern of God, in His hands and under His guidance, took possession alike of imagination and of heart, and communion with the eternal was a translation into the presence of God.

XI

JOHN THE APOSTLE

I

1. I DO not feel as if any discussion on John were either adequate or satisfactory which did not attempt to interpret the leading thought of the Fourth Gospel. If there be such a discussion, it must begin with the relation between the prologue and the history. For the relation is primary. The prologue states in warm and concrete terms ideas so majestic and impressive that thought has, in order that it may sanely reason concerning things so sublime, to disguise them in cold and abstract language; the history shows, by means of breathing and articulate men, how these ideas can, when suitably impersonated, satisfy the heart by solving the most obstinate questionings of the head. The prologue may be described as a thesis; the history may be termed its explication. Without the history the prologue would be but a speculative dream, singular neither in its metaphysics nor in its terminology; without the prologue the history would be but a fragment of biography with a beautiful personality for its centre, but incredible incidents for its circumference. The two points of view need to be combined before the Gospel will discourse to the soul a music it cannot choose but hear.

Yet to show the relation between the two is but a method of exegesis, which uses the prologue to construe the history,

and the history to illustrate the prologue. What is needed to complete the process, is to test the joint result by an appeal to the soul it is intended to satisfy. We shall (1) try to interpret each through the other; and (2) attempt to see what the heart and conscience and reason of man has to say to this interpretation.

2. The prologue is the most distinctive thing in John, which means that it has no parallel in the Synoptic Gospels. Mark, with what seems equal simplicity and courage, begins his history with the baptism of Jesus, saying nothing as to His birth, and leaving His words and actions to tell their own tale. Matthew and Luke, writing for readers more curious and critical, seek to give coherence and credibility to their narratives by prefacing them with genealogies which describe His descent according to the flesh, and stories of His miraculous conception which describe His filiation according to the spirit. Yet the two Synoptists have a difference: — the genealogy of Matthew, which is egressive, begins with Abraham, and comes down to Jesus; that of Luke, which is regressive, ends with Adam, "who was the son of God." The aim, therefore, of Matthew is to prove Jesus a Jew, sprung from the chosen people, the Child of the promise, born to fulfil the law and the prophets; but the aim of Luke is to prove Him a man, the descendant of the common Father, who shares our common lot and possesses our attributes, and therefore He is the Child of humanity, able to speak to all because akin to all. The two aims are rather complementary than incompatible. Matthew's affirms that within our common manhood there is a special clanship; Luke's, that our nature comes from the race, though our peculiar character and customs are from the family and the tribe. The genealogies agree that the same law of descent holds in both cases, in

the case of Jesus as in our own, and that His ancestors, like ours, were not immaculate; for if sinful forefathers meant a guilty descendant, He could not have been innocent. They claimed for Him, whether as Son of Abraham or of Adam, no immunity from the common inheritance of feebleness and shame.

3. As are the genealogies, such also are the birth-stories. Matthew's is, in all its accidents, incidents, local colouring, and temporal conditions, Jewish; prophecy is fulfilled in the very name the Child bears. He is called Jesus, "for He shall save His people from their sins." Luke's is ethnic, describes how Mary became "the handmaid of the Lord," and conceived "the Son of God," who came to establish an everlasting kingdom, to give glory to the highest God and create peace on earth. What is common to the two is the feeling that they are about to describe a person so compacted of Deity and humanity as to be inconceivable without their manifest concurrence as joint factors of His being. The genealogy shows His dependence upon man; His birth proves how He transcends him. They agree in affirming the significance of descent — and this significance is no recent discovery. But they differ: Jesus in the one is made as the Child of Abraham, a Jew and a Semite; and in the other He is represented as a Son of Adam, and a man. The one, being Hebrew, avoids saying, "He is the Son of God"; the other, being both Hellenic and Hellenistic, says boldly, "He is, while man, the Son of the Highest." Matthew could only oppose God and man, and Luke, who unites them, could and did believe that sons of men were also sons of God.

4. But John, though of all the evangelists the man of the boldest and most speculative mind, and also the most tender and trustful heart, feels as if he could not follow any of the

synoptic methods. He could not, like Mark, write simply as a witness of events conceived to be supernatural, for was he not a disciple and a thinker as well as a witness? and how could he show us what he had seen, or tell us what he had heard, without any attempt to give us his own eyes to see with or his own mind to understand with? He could not, like Matthew and Luke, invoke the aid of a genealogy to authenticate the humanity of Jesus, for to him that humanity was too separate and singular to be explained through His ancestry; nor could he, like them, use a miraculous birth-story to define Christ's Deity and distinguish Him from man, for he conceived His transcendence as of a kind no sensuous process could symbolize or prove. The empirical questions as to the links and stages of His descent, or as to the mode of His conception and manner of His birth, which seemed so vital to the older evangelists, had thus no interest and possibly no significance for John. Hence it has been said that the evangelist who had the highest notion of the person had no belief in either the supernatural conception or the miraculous birth; but what was material to him was the person of the Redeemer, His essential nature as implying His essential relations, the ultimate cause of His appearance as defining the character and end of His work. "Find and determine these things," he seems to say, "and the whole truth as to God, nature, man, and history is found and determined. The cause is a sufficient reason for all the effects that follow from it. God as the sovereign source of all things is a transcendental but not a miraculous Being. If we conceive Him aright, we shall also conceive the Christ who is His Word; for to conceive either as an isolated or unordered miracle is to dwell in a universe that knows no God, and to possess a nature that knows nothing of mind and spirit."

II

1. The purpose, then, of the prologue, looked at from below, is to bind man and nature to Christ and Christ to God; or, looked at from above, it is so to conceive God as to make creation and providence, the incarnation and redemption, spring from the spontaneous evolution of the Godhead. John would not, therefore, disconnect time from eternity, but would make time eternal. He desires not to isolate man from God, but so to interpret Christ through God as to make Him the symbol and the means of God's constant and essential indwelling in man. The history he is about to write is brief, a mere fraction cut out of a fleeting moment; but he seeks to bind this fugitive fraction of an instant man can neither seize nor detain to the eternity man can neither measure nor occupy. Infinity thus at once magnifies and transfigures the history it holds and sustains.

Once in the margin of the Bible, opposite its opening verse, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," stood the date "4004 B.C." This short life was not only assigned to the earth, but also reflected in the idea of its insignificance. It was but a single continent whose mountains were like huge links in the chain which held its scattered parts together, whose valleys were the deep furrows on its ancient face, wetted and washed by rains, fretted and worn by tempests, seared by fires within, scorched by the sun without. The earth floated upon mysterious and pathless seas which did not rise and drown the world, though rivers poured without ceasing floods of water into their bosom. In the heavens which formed its roof, the radiant sun rose daily, issued from the east like

a bridegroom from his chamber, strode towards the west with the majesty of a god, and died amid incomparable glories of coloured and pillared clouds. The pale-faced moon as she slowly climbed the sky shed madness from her beams, and in the darkness the stars came out like lamps to light men to bed. But when geology had deciphered the hieroglyphs which the hand of man had not graven on the rocks, and read of a creation which ran through periods of time too illimitable for thought to define; when astronomy had explored the azure roof above us, and found it to be space without bounds within which circled and shone systems and suns innumerable, then man, studying the little point he knew as the mirror and the epitome of the infinite whole he did not know, awoke to the mystery of being, and questioned and looked at it with other and clearer eyes. He did not feel as if the immensity which he had just discovered had dwarfed into insignificance the minute house he inhabited; on the contrary, his home grew but the richer and the more significant, for was it not an epitome of the whole, and did it not hold within it secrets the imagination might represent but the eye could not discern?

2. And this vision of a creation without beginning did not come alone to enhance the glory of the Creator; for the discoveries which revealed the majestic magnitude of the universe disclosed also the complexity yet simple perfection of all its parts. The creative process lengthened behind us till time was lost in eternity, and as the sphere of the created widened around us place expanded into immensity; below us, in the leaf or the insect, the creative achievement was seen to be as careful and as perfect as in the man. Yet without the fixed point of earth the immensity of the universe and the perfection of

its minutest parts could not have been known; as without the ideas of the infinite and the everlasting the meaning of earth could never have been interpreted or its mystery revealed. In like manner, John in his prologue interprets all things through God and sees all in Him. He finds, in the terms Logos and Son, the ideas which turn God from mere abstract existence into a Being concrete and living. He discovers in these the truths which breathe grandeur into his conception of Christ, and through Him confer dignity on nature and man, as well as reality on redemption. And therefore we can say: the history of Jesus, read through this prologue, transfigures man and fills his actual history and possible destiny with the mind and life and majesty of God.

III

But besides the general ideas of the prologue, the verse * which closes it emphasizes certain special ideas as to God, as to the Son of God, and as to His function in the scheme of things.

1. As to God, it is said: "No man hath seen Him at any time." The inability to see God is absolute; the finite can perceive only the finite; the perfect vision of the Infinite is what man, whether embodied or disembodied, can never attain. What is seen occurs at a given moment, occupies a given space, stands before the eye defined, outlined, shaped, and beset by all the conditions of finitude. The infinite can alone behold the Infinite, the mind that does not fill immensity and has not lived from eternity is without the eye that can see the Unbounded, or the thought that can perceive the Eternal. But not to see and

* John i. 18.

not to know are things not simply distinct, but dissimilar. We may know all the better that we do not see. John, for example, repeats this aphorism in his first Epistle,* yet with a most significant difference. It occurs in the midst of a most rapturous discussion on love: Love is absolute, for it constitutes the essence of God.† Love is sovereign, for it determined His greatest and most characteristic act, the mission of His Son.‡ Love is creative, for God's love is the cause of all the love in us.§ Love is universal, for, since God loved us, "we ought to love one another."|| Love is reciprocal, for "we love Him because He first loved us."¶ Love is the evidence of His presence and the energy of His spirit, for "if we love one another, God abideth in us and His love is perfected in us."** The argument at every point is but an expansion of the principle from which it started: "every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God";†† and the clause, "No man hath seen God at any time," is introduced to contrast outward vision, which is not knowledge, with the inner experience or affection, which is. Sight may deceive in a thousand ways; but love is truth, and cannot bear to deceive or be deceived. We may for years pass a man on the street, know his gait, his figure, his stature, his complexion, his voice, all that constitutes his outer form and being; and yet not know the man. We may be able to describe or caricature him to an acquaintance without revealing his identity to a friend. To know him we must find the way into the house where lives the woman he loves, who loves him, and the children he and she love together. We must watch him there, not as he is made up to meet the eyes of men in the street, at business, or on the Exchange; but as he is, where

* 1 John iv. 12. † 8. ‡ 9, 10. § 16.
|| 1 John iv. 11. ¶ 19. ** 12. †† 7.

the nature that is stronger than will can have its way, in his moods of exultation or in his hours of shame, when he rejoices in his strength or moans in his weakness, laughs in his joy or cries in his sorrow, speaks in his meanness or boasts in his pride. Sense may play upon us many a fantastic trick, but experience has the awful power of forcing us to face reality; and in the very process of getting to know, to make ourselves known. So we are grateful that "no man hath seen God at any time," for a visible God were nothing but a spectre of man's own making. Where sight is impossible knowledge may be real, for "he who loveth" knoweth the God who "is love."

2. "The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father." Now there are in this clause one or two notable things. There is the strictest correlation between the terms "Son" and "Father." Where the one is the other must be; where either is not neither can be. If the Sonship is not essential to Deity, there can be no essential Fatherhood. The terms, then, signify that God is, if we may so speak, not an abstract Simplicity, but a concrete Society; His eternal perfection is not an inaccessible solitude, but a beatitude which must be social in order to be. But, besides their correlative necessity, the terms bring out the meaning of the phrase "God is love"; and without distinction of persons there could not be any knowledge or reasoning in God, but with this phrase as its premiss consciousness inevitably follows. For if God were an eternal solitary He could not be essential love or spirit. An object is as necessary to love as a subject; a person to be loved as a person to love. To say, then, "God is love," is to say He is social; for without personal subsistences in the Godhead, how could love have a realm for its being, and a field for its exercise? And this truth receives in the prologue char-

acteristic, if unconscious, expression. The Johannine ideas associated with the Logos are two, "Life" and "Light": "in Him was life," and therefore He created; but once the creation had happened, the "Life" became "the Light of men." And the moment the terms "only begotten" appear, two other Johannine ideas, which in importance far transcend the "Light" and the "Life," at once emerge, "Grace and Truth." For these the concrete and personal name is "Son": 'Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ."* What this means is obvious: if we think of God as Father, we think of Him through the Son, and these terms in correlation signify communicated and reciprocated love. The phrases, therefore, are interchangeable, and express the same fundamental ideas. When in the Gospel John says, "the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father," and in his first Epistle, "God is love," he simply says the same thing.

3. As to the Son's function in Revelation, we read that "He hath declared *Him*." The clause brings the other two together and follows from both — completes both. "No man hath seen God at any time"; but where sight has failed love has succeeded. "The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father," who therefore knew God as God from within and by experience, and not merely from without and by vision — "He hath declared *Him*." And this assumes, and indeed affirms, a philosophical principle of primary importance. Men argue as if our ignorance of the Infinite God was solely a matter of our own incompetence, due to the insufficiency of human faculty, or man's inability to reach and to know. But the argument to be valid must mean much more than this: — God must suffer from a deeper incapability than even man; for if man can-

* i. 17.

not know Him it must be because He is unable to make Himself known. Human impotence is here but the negative pole of a current whose positive is the want of power or of will in Deity. If men cannot know Him, it follows that He cannot speak or show Himself to man. Now, John's argument inverts this principle: — men cannot see God, therefore God must declare Himself; and whatever happens He will not leave us in ignorance, with eyes searching for a light they cannot find. He who made the light shine in the darkness will cause a higher and purer light to shine in our hearts. And the function of the Son is to be the symbol of the love which cannot be spoken, yet will not be silent. Nature may be the visible garment of Deity, yet we may see and touch the robe He wears without seeing and touching Himself. But what Nature could not perform the Son has accomplished; He has spoken of the Father as one who has lived in His bosom, who knows God as God knows Himself, and who can therefore enable man to look at his Maker and His ways with the eye and experience of Deity. To do this the Son came as the only begotten who is in the bosom of the Father. He hath made visible the God no man can see.

IV

But now let us pass to the history, which, by a series of distinct and personified incidents brings out the meaning of the prologue. A person is to John no mere moving figure, but an embodied idea. The biography he writes is the history of the universe in miniature. In it light struggles with darkness, and now the darkness is hostile to the light, and now men who love the light walk in darkness and struggle to escape out of its hands. The history, which

we are about to study, is all the more real that it is a parable in which the soul perplexed by the half-withdrawn light though walking in darkness and groping towards the true light may see itself.

1. The history like a calm and comforting hour had come to Jesus and His disciples, and stands amid storms like a column of light whose beneficent sunshine bathes His soul; while from His fellowship comes a gracious balm which breathes serenity into the spirit of His disciples.* He and they are like travellers who have climbed a lofty mountain with the dense mist so clinging to its steep sides as to impede their progress, hide their path, and create the appalling fear of being lost, or the horror lest a step onward should be an irrevocable step to destruction. But at last and suddenly they have struggled on to the summit and into the sunshine, whence they can watch the lean and ragged fingers of the mist begin to relax their hold on shoulder and peak, making the dark gorges visible; and as the mist-cloud draws out of the valleys and lifts from the plains they can see the vine-clad slopes, the white homesteads, the distant villages and towns, lying fair and beautiful in the sunlight. Nor does the scene below alone appeal to the eye; above the great mountains raised into the silent but glorious heaven their capped heads crowned with perennial snow, made all the more radiant by the eternal azure which seemed to embosom them, and the purple hues which played upon their brows. But as the Master and the disciples stood there, wearied by their toil, yet exhilarated by the scene and the sunshine, new clouds began to gather, thunders to mutter, the sound of a coming tempest filled the air, and a darkness blacker than night descended to blot out the radiant

* John xiv.

day. Yet between the natural scene and the spiritual experience there is this difference: here the Master alone feels the shadow of His approaching passion, and the one thing the disciples know is the joy of the rest and the sunlight.

2. In these men, then, humanity surrounds Jesus; the twelve are an epitome of man, yet of man with eyes the Lord has opened. Their eyes are so unaccustomed to the light that they cannot measure distance or judge proportion, because they see men as trees walking. New instincts and hopes mingle in their imaginations with ancient faiths and facts; and they feel themselves to be men of bewildered and troubled minds. But He has the lucid soul from which nothing is hid. He knows their perplexity, and He foresees His own passion; yet though to foresee is to forefeel, He forgets His own sorrow in the desire to strengthen them against theirs. And this He does by interpreting and so resolving the perplexities they feel but cannot explain. "Let not your heart be troubled,"* He says. There is, indeed, trouble enough in life; some real, more made, a creation of art rather than of Nature and Providence; but, more curious than the making of trouble, is the comfort many find in foretelling it. There are people who cannot see a child at play, or a youth strenuous in the pursuit of some high ideal, or a bride standing in winsome grace beside her bridegroom, or a man struggling under some great enterprise which promises to increase human happiness, without saying, "Ah! wait awhile; this fair hour of promise and of hope will soon pass, and disillusion, disappointment, sorrow, will inevitably come. In the very moment of joy it is well to have the heart troubled with the anticipation of evil." But that is only the language

* John xiv. 1.

of embittered impotence, or of a spirit that cannot bear another's happiness because it has never deserved or earned its own. The true note of magnanimity is not to pour hopeless and imbecile melancholy upon a glad heart; but to shed sunshine and hope upon the hearts that sit fearful in the darkness. Here is Jesus, feeling, all unknown to His disciples, the shadow of the cross and the burden of the world's sin; and He does not seek to sadden them by the foreknowledge of His passion, but rather to increase their joy that they may be the better able to bear the coming loneliness and desolation: "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God."*

3. The man who believes in God believes in a universe the devil has not made and does not rule. If beneficent goodness governs, what permanent harm can come to the good? If man looks to his soul's state, God will look to its happiness. "Believe also in Me."† That was to be a harder task and a higher duty. Belief was easy while He still lived, but would be difficult when they saw Him die upon the cross, forsaken of God, abhorred of man. Yet how, apart from their belief, could faith in Him continue? And so He binds together faith in the God who could not be seen and faith in Himself who, though still visible, was so soon to be visible no more. The union was too natural to be dissoluble. If God alone is holy, could the holy Jesus owe His existence to any other Being? If God be absolutely just, could He forsake the righteous and perfect man simply because evil men had hated Him and had by craft compassed His death? If He had been so forsaken, faith in God would have perished of the act. "In My Father's house are many mansions."‡ Where God is heaven is, and His home is the universe. But heaven is a place of

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.* ‡ xiv. 2.

"many mansions," where every soul will find a house suitable to its capacity, its stage of culture, or whatever we may term the nature or quality which demands a special and adapted environment. "I go to prepare a place for you."* He has a function in eternity as well as in time; there as here He knows every man, and for each He makes ready a place that shall be a home indeed.

V

1. "And whither I go, ye know the way."† Here the significant dialogue begins; man is by John so impersonated in the disciples that each person is a type, who represents a distinct species of the genus man. Thomas is man prosaic, sensuous, positive as to the reality of things seen, very doubtful as to the existence or truth of the unseen. He is often described as the "unbelieving Thomas," but he would be better named the "misbelieving." Sceptics are of two classes, those who so believe their reason that they will not trust their senses, and those who so trust their senses that they will not believe their reason. The former are intellectually subtle, and argue themselves into disbelief not only of the senses, but of the processes and products of the very reason which they must trust to be rational; the latter are intellectually simple, and argue themselves into disbelief of the reason because its judgments and inferences contradict the testimony of the senses or impugn their veracity. To the one class, the philosophical sceptics, belong the men who doubt because they think, and whose doubt, as it is the product of reason, only reason can overcome; the other class comprehends the slaves of habit, the

* *Ibid.* † xiv. 4.

children of custom and convention, who walk by sight, and speak of seeing as believing, and who are so credulous as to trust only what the hands have handled and the fingers have touched.

Now it is to this class that Thomas belongs, an honest man, strong and courageous where he can see and feel, resolved not to go one step farther than his senses show him to be safe, yet ready to trust them whatever they may say or wherever they may lead. So when Jesus proposes to go to the dead Lazarus, "to the intent ye may believe," Thomas, with the courage of a man who could follow and the obstinacy of a man who could not believe what his senses did not certify, said, "Let us also go that we may die with Him."* And so, too, when he heard the other disciples discoursing with ecstasy on the appearances of the risen Lord, he dourly said: — "Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails,and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into His side, I will not believe."† The man wanted to believe; but he could not, his conscience would not allow him, till his senses were satisfied. So with characteristic bluntness and no less characteristic blindness where things of the Spirit were at issue, he said, "Lord, we know not whither Thou goest; how know we the way?"‡ Jesus answers in a fashion that must have bewildered Thomas still more: "I am the way, the truth, and the life,"§ i.e. the path that conducts to the goal, the light that illumines the path, and the goal to which it conducts. He is all in all, everywhere and for every one sufficient, as solitary and preëminent in His person and functions as is the Deity. And then, in the familiar Johannine method translating the abstract into the concrete, He adds: "No one cometh unto the Father but by Me:

* John xi. 16. † xx. 25. ‡ xiv. 5. § xiv. 6.

he who has known Me has known Him; in Me He has become visible."*

2. And now while Thomas is silently pondering the mysterious answer he has received, the change in the mode of speech calls up another interlocutor. Philip is a man little known, but the little we do know is suggestive. He is neither sent by the Baptist nor brought by another, but "found" by Jesus Himself.† They were attracted to each other by affinities of spirit. And two things indicate the kind of man he was: (*α*) his special friend, the man he could claim as convert and companion, was Nathanael, the guileless Israelite,‡ and (*β*) the Greeks who wanted to see Jesus come first to Philip, and were brought to the Master by him.§ He was evidently a meditative man, drawn by the gentleness of God, giving light by seeking it, touched by the quest of men for the humanities of Deity.

So the reference to the Father appealed to his deepest need and woke the desire that most consumed him. "Lord! shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us."|| Jesus starts like one smitten with sudden pain, though it is pain that has a heart of pleasure, and asks: "Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know Me, Philip?" Did you ever try to teach men, and had you ever a loved pupil of high promise over whom you have spent brooding nights and toilsome days in the hope that all his promise might yet be realized? And have you never found in some ecstatic moment of thought and discussion this same pupil put a question which showed that he had never seen into the heart of your teaching, or even so much as guessed that it had a heart? You may then be inclined to blame your own blundering or your fatal inability to be articulate where

* John xiv. 7. † John i. 43. ‡ John i. 45–7.
§ xii. 20–2. || xiv. 8–9.

the deepest beliefs are concerned, and to forget that what you have won by agony of thought and experience cannot be understood by those who have never been cradled by suffering into thought. If that has been your experience, then you will be able to understand the mood and mind of Jesus, His pain at having a disciple who had not learned, His joy at discovering the disciple to be still a learner whose ignorance was richer than any knowledge. For in Philip Jesus heard the voice of collective man confess his deepest need, "Shew us the Father"; heard, too, men speak that word of infinite promise, "and it sufficeth us." The fact that "no man hath seen God at any time," and that he must yet see Him or die, begets the prayer, "Lord, shew us the Father"; and the answer, which assures peace, is, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." "The only begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath interpreted the invisible God." Jesus as the revelation of the God who cannot be seen is the governing idea of John's Gospel; and the man who sees Him is satisfied. He loves, and therefore he knows the God who is love.

XII

JOHN THE APOSTLE

I

THE questions which our attempts at interpreting both the prologue and the history have raised, must now be discussed. What value and validity for man have the ideas as to the invisible God who has become visible in the Son? Can he and they be said to correspond? Can they be described as ideas that, although not products of his reason, yet appeal to it and satisfy it? And have they any light to shed on the general problem of the relation of revelation to nature and mind?

1. The prologue which started our discussion stated an incapacity of nature in the form of a fact of experience — "no man hath seen God at any time"; the history expresses a need of nature which the incapacity makes only the more urgent and acute: "Shew us the Father." These are what we may call the antinomies of nature and experience, laws which may seem to be opposed, but which can neither invalidate nor annul one another. Man's need for God is too strong to be satisfied by the plea of a natural incapacity; his desire to find Him is too invincible to be silent at the bidding of an impotent experience. The saying of Augustine is familiar to all: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee." Now the inquietude of the heart is but its need of God expressed in dumb desire.

Man was made by God for God, and he cannot do without the God who made him. Atheism is a thing of art, not of nature; an individual may train or persuade himself to believe it, but it has never been the spontaneous belief of any tribe or age, never the collective need of any century or speech of any country. At most it is but a negation, and a negation is without the secret of life; it may have power to destroy, but it has none to construct. It is only a belief that another belief is false; it is not a belief that a given truth is so real that the universe may be built on it, and that what bears up the universe may well support our lives. And this is what faith in God means to the soul, and why the soul feels so insatiable a need for the faith.

2. It is now a generation since the autobiography of John Stuart Mill was published, but it is full of lessons that can never grow old. In it he told us that his father thought dualism more reasonable than monotheism, and agnosticism more reasonable than either; for he had come to the conclusion that concerning the origin of things nothing whatever could be known; that he himself was one of the really few who had been brought up outside the Christian religion, who had never believed or practised it, and who as socially and intellectually independent of it was able to think of it justly and judge it impartially. But in so writing he forgot several things he ought to have remembered: (i) While his father came to think in the way just stated he did not begin by so thinking. He was trained for the Christian ministry; was a candidate for the ministerial office, and would have been a minister if he had been accepted by a congregation. (ii) The position he reached he reached by reaction against his own understanding of the theology in which he had been educated.

The God he rejected was not "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," but a perfectly impossible deity, an almighty maker of hell for men and men for hell. If James Mill had but thought more consistently he would have seen that to deny this God was to become not an atheist, but rather a more perfect theist.

(iii) John Stuart Mill showed how little he understood either himself or his day or the Christian religion when he spoke of having been brought up outside it or in independence of it. That was impossible in his age and place; what fills the air a man breathes, what penetrates the language he speaks, what pervades the literature he reads, what leavens the thought of his people, is embodied in their institutions, and is the mother of all their philanthropies as well as the spirit which qualitatively distinguishes their modern from the ancient world, — is a thing from which the man cannot escape, especially if he be a man as susceptible and assimilative as was John Stuart Mill. (iv) As he misconceived the religion, he never judged it impartially, nor could he. He thought he was neutral when he was not; and where he failed to appreciate he was quite unable to criticize. (v) Yet he, perhaps more than any man of his day, witnessed to the veracity and vitality of man's need for God, which persists in spite of the incapacity to see Him. He confessed that he did not believe that the universe had an author and governor infinite in goodness and power, yet his whole being confessed that he was bound to regulate and direct his life towards the highest good. But a single life cannot be detached from the whole; if there is a good for one there must be a good for all, and if obligation is to govern an individual it must have its sanction in the system men call the universe.

3. Now, under what form did Mill conceive this direc-

tive power? "The ideal of a perfect Being to whom he could habitually refer as the guide of conscience." But what did this mean save that the man who had got rid of God as an idea had to enthrone an ideal to do His work? In other words, by denying God he was obliged to invent a substitute for Him; and what sort of substitute did he invent? He loved; and though I may have my own strong convictions as to the moral character of the process which turned his love into a passion and broke up a household that but for him might have continued one and happy, yet I note only the fact that he loved and lost. And the woman he lost became, the further he retreated from her living presence, a memory that ruled his life. And he loved to think the thoughts that would have pleased her, to do the things she would have approved, till his attitude became a kind of worship and her memory "a sort of religion." And has not this tale a moral as true as it is pathetic? The man who could not believe in a God of "perfect goodness" found a substitute for Him in the apotheosis of a woman who owed her perfection and function as an ideal to the imagination of the man who mourned her, and who could not bear to lose her influence from his life. If the logic of incapacity had never a more illustrious victim than John Stuart Mill, man's need for God had never a more veracious witness than the tragic sequel to his disappointed love.

II

1. If now man's incapacity to see God, so far from suppressing his need of Him, only renders it the more active and acute, are there any means or standards by which we can define the kind of God he needs? Well, then, it is

evident that God must represent his highest idea and that this idea will reflect and articulate what is best and most essential in himself. Now we may describe the self of man as constituted by reason, conscience, and heart; or thought, moral judgment, and a free and motived will; and the elements necessary to him must be repeated in his highest idea, the God who is the impersonated ideal that governs his life.

2. Man is by preëminence the thinker; thought is his very essence, and the more and better he thinks the higher and the nobler grows his manhood. When he explains nature he interprets himself, for it is only in the degree that he perceives it to be reasonable that he becomes rational. But thought is a thing of spirit, not of matter: it is without form or figure, is neither ponderable nor divisible, may be spoken or written, communicated or evolved, but can neither be measured nor handled. There have, indeed, been men who have described thought as a product of organization and a function of brain. "Ohne Phosphor kein Gedanke." Without phosphorus no thought, said one who imagined that to coin a graphic phrase was to solve a serious problem. But how out of phosphorus as a mere special kind of matter can you educe immaterial thought? by what alchemy can the ponderable be changed into the imponderable? by what art or craft can the atom which gravitation rules become the mind which speculates concerning the law that governs the universe of atoms but does not control thought? Things so incommensurable and so separated by the whole diameter of being cannot by experiment be converted into each other, or by analysis resolved into the products of a common factor. It is a very easy thing, indeed, to correlate organization and consciousness, but how does that prove organization to

be the cause of thought, or thought a product of the organized brain?

3. A very distinguished German biologist, who loves to gird at benighted theologians and to carry what he conceives to be the war into what he imagines to be their camp, has proposed what he considered to be here a grand test of truth. "Just take," he says, "the brain of a man, with all its grey matter, its lobes and wonderful convolutions, and put it in a casket, and put in a second casket beside it the brain of a well-developed anthropoid ape; then submit the two to a competent arbiter, say, the inhabitant of some distant planet, that he may tell us whether there is any insurmountable difference or impassable gulf between them." Now, there are decided controversial advantages in this sort of reference. For one thing the man who makes it determines the terms of the problem, and to be able to do this is to make sure of the solution that will be offered. For another thing the arbiter, though he is supposed to come from another planet, is only another form of the man who appeals to him; and so is certain to return a verdict in terms agreeable to the appellant. And thus the imaginative act is but a legal fiction by means of which the brains can be judicially declared not, indeed, to be identical, but to be capable of becoming so nearly alike as to be indistinguishable, so much so that each may be equal to performing the functions of the other.

4. But let us ask our visitor to pause; we, too, have a problem for him, though it somewhat differs from the one so lightly put and so easily solved. Bring two other caskets and place them alongside those already there. Into the one which stands beside the ape's brain let us put the history of his race, if history they may be said to have, telling

how they have lived in the forest, climbed trees, cracked nuts, courted, fought, hungered and fed, without change or variation from the earliest moment of observation to our own day. Into the casket which stands beside the brain of man place the history of his civilization, if not as written yet as transacted and realized, the story of the arts he has invented and the art he has cultivated; of the empires he has founded, the governments he has established, the states and the cities he has built; of the literatures he has written, the music he has created, the religions he has professed; of the tragedies which have made his life stern and the comedies which have filled it with mirth and humour; of the beliefs he has lived by, the ideals he has pursued, the hopes that have cheered his desolation, and the loves that have out of his very weakness made him strong. And then, when our two supplemental caskets have been filled, let us turn to our judicial visitor and say: "We pray you, as one who knows how serious a thing life is and how much they who would live it honestly need truth as their guide, help us to solve this problem; whether we may regard these two brains, which differ so slightly in matter, weight, and organization, as the cause of the acts which represent the immense differences between their respective races and their contrasted achievements. We are not greatly concerned as to their cranial resemblances, or as to whether the lower brain is capable of becoming even as the higher; but we do strongly desire to discover whether in their structural or material differences the causes of the histories distinctive of the separate owners is to be found."

Our urgency might disturb the celestial calm of the judge to whom our terrestrial controversies may well seem trivial; but if his heavenly pity were to overcome his natural irritation we may conceive him replying somewhat thus: "The

problems move in very different regions; the brain is a question in the history of nature, civilization a question in the history of mind; and effects which so differ can hardly be conceived as having like or equal causes." "True," we make reply, "but the essential nature of the ape is unfolded in his history, the essential nature of man unfolded in his civilization; and do you find the natures which have been thus unfolded stored in the brains you have been invited to examine?" And he answers: "How can I? Man's civilization is the creation of reason, thought, mind; without these it could not have been, and these no brain made nor is there in its mechanism anything to show how they came to be. Man is mind, and though mind may need an organ for its material expression it cannot be conceived as dependent for its very existence on the organ it uses." "How, then, do you explain the being of mind?" "It is older than man, for it is the Father of all things; it took shape in him because it is increate and eternal; the Reason that is God brought nature into being and made man become. The root of the creation blossoms into its finest fruit; the Architect of the universe could realize His universe only by means of beings who were spirits like Himself. The thought that built civilization but repeats and reflects the thought that created nature."

III

1. But man is conscience as well as thought. Paul tells us that the heathen have no written law, yet do by nature the things it enjoins; that they are a law to themselves, and have its commands written on the tables of the heart; and that the existence of this inner law is proved by two concordant witnesses, the voice of conscience

and the moral judgments of men, whether condemnatory or approbatory, which they pass upon both each other and themselves.* He also tells us that while by nature the knowledge of God is manifest in them,† yet it has seemed good to many not to retain this knowledge;‡ that He made them to obey the truth, but they have obeyed unrighteousness;§ and that to those who seek by obedience to attain eternal life He will award glory, honour, and immortality; but upon those who are disobedient He will visit wrath and indignation.|| From these positions three notable things follow: (*α*) there is in man a conscience on which the finger of God has written the duty required of him; (*β*) he is able to obey or disobey this duty; and (*γ*) God will exact from every man an account as to how he has dealt with this law and how he has used this freedom.

2. These are in an equal measure truths of nature and of revelation; it is because the one knows them that the other can speak of them and so enhance their authority. It is because of the law within that no virtue of the heathen can ever be a splendid vice; that nature is ever on the side of virtue; that by following it man can at once transcend and realize himself, for he carries within a standard which changes him from a mortal individual into a vehicle of the eternal and universal; and that he is able, while doing what it most becomes himself to do, to do also what most serves man — found states, frame codes of duty, speak a common ethical language, recognize and fulfil common obligations. It is because he is free that he can do the thing he ought; that, since he is able to create fresh good his obligation to do it is absolute; and that he is not so fettered by the inheritance of an ignoble past as to be absolved from the duty of introducing a more gracious future. And it is

* Rom. ii. 14, 15. † i. 19. ‡ i. 28. § 19, 21. || ii. 7, 8.

because God is above and over us all that actions done in time yet range towards eternity; that our temporal is the germ of our immortal being; that while we are, singly, but units, yet we do not constitute a universe of atoms, but a coördinated unity, created by a law which the individual can obey, but the whole alone can realize. Hence comes our conclusion: Conscience in man demands righteousness in God; a moral Deity is involved in a moral mankind; unless God be absolutely holy and pure man will not be able to do Him reverence. The law implanted in us requires that the highest idea, if it be so articulated as to be an object of worship, shall be one that while evoking adoration yet awes and uplifts the adorer.

3. The man who is reason and conscience is also heart. It can be as truly said of man as of God, "he is love"; where it is not there is no humanity. "Intellect without affection" defines neither man nor God, but only the devil. Invest Satan with all the power of the Almighty, yet leave him in every other respect unchanged, and he would not thereby become like God, but only a thousand-fold more the child of hell than before. For what makes a person a devil and his environment a hell save the want of love? For where there is no love there is simply an insatiable selfishness, guarded by a suspicion that can never trust and a fear that cannot rest. The loveless man loves his own happiness, but that of no other being. Around him are multitudes who desire happiness, some asking it from him or seeking to attain it with him and through him; but he, as void of love, desires happiness for himself alone and sacrifices theirs to his, though he soon discovers that selfish happiness is but the lust that begets misery and turns into despair. And a loveless man who despairs of pleasure is indeed a terrible being. More ruthless than any beast of

prey, he can spoil innocence and glory in its shame; he can rejoice in the pallor that steals upon the cheek once ruddy with health; the cry of the orphan comes to sound like music in his ear; the ravages of disease and crime and death wake in him no pity, though they may stir the horror that fears for himself. And there is no misery like the misery of him in whom fear for self has taken the place of love for others, who reads danger in every human face, sees an enemy in every living form, who hears disaster murmured in every breeze, disease blown about on every wind, or death threatened by every exhalation. He who fears for himself alone will find suspicion of others so grow on him that carefulness on their part will seem but a new monition of danger and a cause of deeper fear; and in his dreaded yet desired isolation he will come to feel as if all the agony of earth were impersonated in his single breast. It is this that makes the loveless a Satanic state; for hell is created by the hate which begets suspicion and solitude. Where no being loves and every being fears, where no eye can close, for every other eye watches for the opportunity of gratifying jealousy or envy, of indulging malice or the revenge that lusts to murder, there is hell, and the men who make their home in it are devils. But if love be so necessary to man, what must it be to God? The loveless Maker of a universe were a being we could neither revere nor adore. Yet is not this very inability a witness to the moral character of our Creator? He so made us that we could not worship an almighty devil, who were a being a coward might flatter, but no man could praise. We can love only the lovable, and only where love is can there be the will to do good and the power to accomplish it. To be without heart is to be able to seduce innocence without remorse; and not even the seduced can love the remorseless seducer. Man may

yield to the devil's temptation, but it does not follow that he on that account loves the devil; nay, he may hate him all the more that he has not tempted in vain. God, then, to be a Being man can worship must be the impersonated goodness he can admire and adore, reasonable in all His acts, righteous in all His works, gracious in all His ways. Were He less than this our souls could not be persuaded to the obedience which is realized love.

IV

1. Such is the God needed to satisfy the higher and better nature in man. But that nature has this curious quality — the higher and better it becomes the less easily is it satisfied, especially in those things it does or produces for its own delectation. And it is not surprising that refined nature should be most justly dissatisfied with the work of its barbarous state in the highest region of thought, and more especially with the sort of gods it then made and bade man worship. It is out of this inability of man to satisfy nature in the matter of religion that the need for revelation has come; for revelation means that unless God makes Himself known man will never really know Him, or, in other words, can never realize the perfect religion. For the higher our idea of God rises, the less can we deny to Him the power and the right of speech. The race that could not speak would not be rational, for what were reason without the gift of expression? A dumb race — i.e. one without the power to make and to use language — would be a race without intelligence. The thought that cannot be uttered is thought that does not live. And so God in the very degree that He is reason will speak; that He is righteous, will act and govern; that He is

love, will show Himself gracious. And how can He speak unless He addresses those who hear? How can He govern unless He reigns over those who are able to obey? And how can He be gracious unless He declare Himself to those who stand in need of His love?

But these are all personal acts, not possible of expression save in personal forms, not capable of apprehension save by persons. And this signifies that if God is to be revealed it must be, on the one hand, by His own spontaneous action, and, on the other, by the use of a medium which we may conceive as an objective personality to Him, and which is essentially such to us. There is a familiar tale of the Italian boy who became the most famed of sculptors, sitting long and pensively before the supreme work of his master, wondering, admiring, judging as only an artist can. The master watched the boy, and read in the eager yet shadowed face the verdict of posterity. Suddenly the lad rose and turned sadly away, murmuring to himself: "It needs but one thing to be perfect." Much did the master marvel at the boy's speech, and one day, seeking knowledge that he might die in peace, he asked his pupil: "Michael, what did that statue of mine need to be perfect?" "Need, Master? it needed speech." It had received from its creator's genius everything but life; and without that what was it but a dead and graven image? And what is nature but a dumb creation with man sitting before her open-eyed and wondering, asking whence she has come and he with her? Whither he and she are together going? She, silent and sphinx-like, answers only by her sculptured face and couchant figure, leaving the imagination of man to reply to the questions which his reason has asked. But God could not leave man to such a dumb instructrix; the creature He had made that He

might love appealed too strongly to His heart. "The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, He declared *Him*." The men who see the Son, see the Father; and from Him who has ever lived in God, they learn to know what God is.

2. If the revelation of God must be through a person, then where in all history can we find so suitable a personal medium as Jesus Christ, one whose manhood is so calculated to make our conception of God more sublime and gracious? The character of the interpreter adds its finest qualities to His interpretation. We believe that He lived in God and we seek God through Him; the affinity of His manhood with God brings Deity near us, while the affinity of our manhood with His lifts us nearer to Deity. As the medium of revelation He is like the great aërial ocean which floats round and enfolds our earth; without it gravitation could not exercise its mystic power, binding mass to mass, planet to sun and system to system, and making of immensity a shoreless sea in which worlds sail more noiselessly and sure than were they guided by rudder and compass; without it the light and heat which the sun flings from his burning face would never visit us and change our cold earth from a dwelling of death into the home of rational life. Why He is qualified to be so lucid a medium is expressed in His very name; He is "the Son," or, as the *Te Deum* has it, "the everlasting Son of the Father." The two notions are inseparable; where the Father is the Son must be; if we had no "everlasting Son" we could have no essential or eternal Father. And each is as the other is. The machine witnesses to the skill of the mechanic; the pupil to the learning or genius of the master; the son to the character and qualities of the father. The gentleness, the grace, the sternness, the patience, the inflexible

integrity towards men which mark the One distinguish also the Other. There were men who were wont to argue as if God's Fatherhood signified mere indulgent good nature, as if His goodness prevented Him from being a cause of suffering and would not even allow Him to see a creature suffer; and they forgot that Jesus could be fierce as well as gentle, angry as well as gracious, and that man could by his sin not, indeed, punish God, yet inflict upon Him the sorest suffering. Then there were other men who, on the contrary, argued as if God were so severe and austere that while the insult of the sinner's sin moved Him to anger, the misery of the sinner's state did not touch Him with pity. Thus a distinguished and subtle divine defined Sovereignty and Fatherhood, when predicated of Deity, as, respectively, titles of nature and of grace; God as Sovereign having over against all men rights He must enforce, but as Father duties of tenderness and care which were proper only to His own; and one who heard Him discourse on this distinction said "that man would take from God all that makes Him divine and gracious." But there could not be a more unreal antithesis, for the father who is not a sovereign and never enforces his authority and rights, is but the shiftless head of a shiftless family. There is indeed nothing so mischievous in public politics or in private morals as the easy good nature which fears the giving of pain too much to be able to punish wrong. And the sovereign who is not the conscious father of his people is no just king, but is an owner and a disposer of chattels rather than a ruler of men. In God these two constitute a noble unity, all His paternal acts are regal, all His regal functions are paternal. An emasculated Deity, incapable of the anger that burns like a consuming fire against iniquity and oppression, were no Deity fit to hold the reins of a wicked

and guilty world; and a pitiless God who never saw the pathos of the sinner's lot, whether he sins against his will or in the flowing tide of irresistible inclination, is not equal to the sovereignty of a fallen race. The two functions need then to be sublimed into a fine and balanced harmony that God may reign in love and yet man be saved from his sin.

V

1. But though these functions constitute a unity, they express also a difference. God is one, but He has an infinity of attributes, every attribute denoting a distinct quality in the Divine character, or a special aspect in the Divine relations. And so here the sovereign is concerned with authority and law, but the father with the child and his obedience. The first thought of the purely legal monarch is order, and how to maintain it; the first thought of the regal parent is the family and how to preserve it. The relations and acts of the sovereign are impersonal and juridical, but those of the father are personal and ethical. The former enforces law that he may vindicate justice and uphold order; the latter maintains authority that he may discipline and benefit his children. The sovereign honours the law by punishing the transgressors, and in order to do this he builds a prison that so far from reforming may only further corrupt and deprave the wrongdoer; but the father vindicates authority by chastisement, which is distinguished from penalty by seeking not so much to create fear of law and of its majesty as to reclaim the disobedient and uplift the fallen. The one regards the whole, the other the persons who compose it. The sovereign says: "I impersonate the law without which there would be no society and

no state, no justice between man and man, no fear of wrong and unfaithfulness, no security for property and no guardianship of rights." But the father says: "I am the embodied providence of the family, toil for it, spin for it, think of all its members, help all and love all, especially the helpless, the unloved and the unlovable."

2. But the very difference in the functions makes their unity and concurrence in God the more needful to the seemliness of His action. It would not be Godlike to save by being unjust to law, any more than it would be godly in us to think of His majesty to the neglect of His grace. We can as little imagine that it would become God to save the guilty by doing indignity to justice, violating order or tarnishing right, as to conceive that it would be agreeable to Him to think that He magnified justice by forgetting mercy and dealing pitilessly by the miserable mortals who could not choose but sin. Sovereignty is as normal as fatherhood, fatherhood as normal as sovereignty; and it is by showing their complete and indefeasible unity that the Christian redemption so glorifies God. If He had not been Sovereign, man would never have needed reconciliation to Him; if He had not been Father, the means of reconciliation never could have been found. The sovereignty which loves law, upholds justice, and institutes order, could not have winked at sin or benignly smiled on the transgressor; the fatherhood which has a heart for men and pity for the forlorn could not have allowed red-handed vengeance to work its will upon a fallen race. But if without the sovereignty there would have been no need for a Redeemer, yet if there had been nothing else He would not have been possible. For law has power to punish, but none to save; justice has the will to vindicate the denied authority, but not to deliver the denier; and so the God

who has only regal rights and legal instruments could never have permitted the guilty to escape, let alone have provided the means for its attainment. But with the Fatherhood there could not but be a Redeemer, and redemption by suffering; for the sin of the child is the sorrow of the parent. And is there anything so absolutely irrepressible as the grief that would die to save the son who has been its cause?

3. The positions thus reached are fundamental, and ought to supply us with standards for the appraisement of cardinal evangelical doctrines. (i) The Father and the Son cannot be placed in opposition; they agree in will, though they differ in function. The Son is not the rival, but the agent of the Father; He does not cancel, but fulfils the purposes of the Sovereign. (ii) The work which expresses the common will is as much the Father's as the Son's. His blood does not purchase the Divine love, for the love that could be bought by blood were not divine; but it expresses the sorrow of Him who gave, the suffering of Him who was given, and the sacrifice which was made by both. (iii) The sovereign, though he may will the good of the law-breaker, yet cannot save him by breaking the law himself, for that would be to gratify pity at the expense of order and all it stands for; the father, though he may feel hindered by authority and may hate the shame of penalty, yet must regard their rights, for to do otherwise would be to make himself the slave of the wrongdoer and the approver of the wrong he does. The common suffering of Father and Son is a joint homage to the sovereignty; their union in sacrifice is the witness to the fatherhood. (iv) The eternal and essential unity expressed in "the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father" is fulfilled and realized under historical conditions when Christ so did

the Father's will as, on the one hand, to reconcile man to God, and, on the other hand, to incline and qualify man to do what is well pleasing in His sight. (v) As the Son became the standard regulative of Christian conduct, He also becomes the principle regulative of Christian thought. That principle is to the Greek the orthodoxy of the church; to the Roman its infallibility as embodied in the Pope and articulated by him; to the Lutheran justification by faith, which, as it is accepted or denied, decides whether a church shall stand or fall; to the Reformed, who was here the more radical and so nearer the truth, it was the gracious will and character of God. "The grace" of the reformed divine was indeed not always gracious, but he did right in beginning not with any special church or any personal doctrine, but with the God who was the source of all religion and the matter of all thought. There, too, we would begin, not indeed with the God of a nature "red in tooth and claw," or with the absolute and the abstract, which is the Deity of philosophy, but with the God the Son declared. Where He placed us there we stand, and look at God through His eyes, and at man with a vision He has clarified and enlarged; and we come to understand how it is that when man sinned God could not but suffer, and how His suffering became a sacrifice which reconciles the guilty to the All-Good. And so we come to see how profoundly true is the word of Paul: — "Christ Jesus is made unto us of God, wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption, that it may be according as it is written. He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."

INDEX

The Index needs to be studied in connection with the very full Table of Contents.

A

Abelard, 75
Æstheticism, 426
Agnosticism, 73, 81, 105
Ainsworth, Henry, 218, 221 n., 236
à Kempis, Thomas, 58, 408
Ambrose, 75
Anglican Church, 6, 111, 116, 118, 123, 136, 141, 157, 208-12, 225, 229; its relation to the State, 240–1, 411–13; the polity of, 120, 122; Sacerdotalism in, 120–22, 123
Anglo-Catholic movement, 117, 137
Anselm, 57
Antioch, the Church at, 495–501
Apocalypse, the, 162, 442, 588, 590
Apocalyptic Literature, 442–4
Apollos, 546
Apostles, the, 19, 285, 300, 301–5
— education of the, 373–82
— Acts of the, its author and his characteristics, 516–19; his attitude to Greeks, 525–30; relation of Acts to Pauline epistles, 527 n.
Apostolic Constitutions, 193
Apostolic Succession, 121, 404
Aquila, 533, 545
Aquinas, Thomas, 57, 75
Aramaic in N.T., 355, 383, 387, 574
Aristotle, 81, 145 n., 327
Arnold, M., 77, 85, 86, 170
Art and Religion, 73, 259–63
Athanasius, 75, 107, 233, 234
Athleticism, 426
Augustine, St., 37, 75, 200, 276, 407–8, 610
— of Canterbury, 183 n., 277
Authority, 136

B

Bacon, Francis, 237, 396
Baptism, 121
Baptists, 236
Barnabas, 136, 165, 494-5, 498, 501, 503–5, 518–24
Barrowe and Greenwood, 210, 219 n., 235
  Barrowe, Henry, 217
  Greenwood, John, 217
Baur, Ferdinand, 185 n., 249, 517 n., 518, 527 n.
Baxter, R., 278, 409
Benson, E. W., 193
Bernard, St., of Clairvaux, 58, 107, 587
Bible, 294, 419
Bishops, 120–22; in early Church, 132, 164, 168
— in Apostolic Constitutions, 193
— in Clementine Literature and Ignatian Epistles, 177–79
Boethius, 327
Bridge, William, 236
Browne, Robert, 216 n., 234–5
Browning, Robert, 72, 514
Brownism, as contrasted with Puritanism, 217 n.
Buddha, 394
Bunyan, 278, 409
Burke, E., 366
Burnet, 112 n., 114
Busher, L., on "Religious Peace," 236
Butler, Bishop, 76

C

Calvin, 107, 277, 278, 407, 409
Carlyle, 58

Cartwright, Thomas, 208, 211, 217 n., 409
Catholicism, 137; see under *Roman Church*
Celsus, 38, 53, 75, 85, 86, 406
Chalmers, Thomas, 472 n.
Charlemagne, 55 n.
Charles II., 112 n., 113, 152, 213, 241
Chillingworth, Wm., 237, 238 n.
Christian Ethics, 198–201, 420
— Idea of God, 90, 92, 138, 613–21; Place of Revelation in, 621 *seq*
— Idea of man, 92
— Religion in first century, 3–46; the ideal period of its history, 7; its missions, 17; its conflict with Rome, 39; and Judaism, 170; in the nineteenth century, 47–108; attitude of cultured towards, 72; and working-classes, 77, 95
Christian worship, 264 *seq.*
Christianity and Science, 90
Christianity and Capital and Labour, 98, 425, 426
Church, the, and the churches, 3, 410–14; the ideal of, 4; and Ancient Heathenism, 53; as political Power, 55; the making of, 306–21; and State, 55 n., 152, 424; and the future, 64; its enthusiasm for humanity, 93; its right to be, 101; its beginnings, 132; the churches and the kingdom, 134; the word "church" in its usage at the Reformation, 145 n.; Church in contrast with Temple, 258; the idea in teaching of Jesus, 371–431; the constituents of, 393 *seq.*; Christ, the creative energy in, 404–10; the Invisible, 410; the historical churches, 411–14; as the incarnation of Christ as prophet, priest, and king, 415–23
Cicero, 200
Clement of Alexandria, 166, 193 n., 406
Clement of Rome, 75, 176, 177, 189 n.
Clementines, 166 n., 179–83, 185
Coleridge, S. T., 62
Comte, 87
Confucius, 394
Congregational Ideal (see Independence), 111, 143; meaning of term, 144–5; the early ideal, 214, 225; not sacerdotal, 227
Constantine and the Church, 55 n., 234
Cranmer, Thomas, 145 n., 409
Criticism of the N.T., 247–52
Cromwell, Oliver, 111, 112, 230
Cross, doctrine of the, 24–31, 446, 452–57
Cudworth, 238 n.
Cyprian, 75, 185, 193, 201, 405 n.

D

Dante, 39 n., 58, 396, 408
Death of Jesus Christ, 371, 373, 445–68
Deism, 60, 80
Democritus, 81
δικαιοσύνη, 347; Paul's usage as compared with Matthew's, 359–60
Disciples, the, of the Lord, 286, 288–9, 296–305, 311
Doctrine, Christian, 196–8, 419
Dogma and Doctrine, 250
Duns Scotus, 57

E

Eastern Church, 411–12, 424
Ecclesiastical Polity and the Religion of Christ, 142–75, 195; Autocracies, 151; Presbyterian Polity, 152; "Communal" Polity, 155; how to be judged, 155; Monarchical and Republican, 156; growth of, 194
Ecclesiastical Polity, and Christian Doctrine, 196–8
Ecclesiastical Polity and Christian Ethics, 198–201
Edwards, Jonathan, 410, 449 n.
ἐκκλησία, 145, 169, 203, 378, 382–8; its usage in Hellenistic Greek, 385 n.; how it ought to be translated, 389–92
Ephesus, 546, 552–6
Epictetus, 34, 75
Epicurus, 82
Episcopacy, 118, 151, 168, 182; Development of, in early Church, 183

Episcopate, 122, 164
Erasmus, 409
Established Churches, 103, 141
Eucharist, 121, 276
Evangelical Revival, 116
Evolution and Ethics, 92
— and Religion, 87

F

Fatherhood of God, 129
filioque, 411–12
Fox, George, 409
Free Churches, 4, 103, 105, 127; their ideals, 140, 421–3
Freedom, its distinction from Liberty, 422–3
Fuller, Thos., 208, 210, 217 n.

G

Galatians, Epistle to the, 499, 500, 519; analysis of, 521–4 n.
Gale, Theophilus, 114
Galilee, as scene of Jesus' ministry in first and second periods, 287–8, 433–7
Gallio, 534–5, 566–9
Gamaliel, 486–7
Gardiner, S. R., on Puritans, 209 n.
Gardner, Professor P., 437
Gauden, Bishop, 114
Geneva and the Reformation, 206–7
Gibbon, 36, 37, 39 n., 53
Goethe, 83
Goodwin, Thomas, 114
Gore, Bishop, 163 n.
Gospel, the Fourth, see under *John the Apostle*
Gospels Synoptic, Lord's Prayer in Matthew and Luke compared, 352 n., 355; genealogies in Matthew and Luke, 593; birth-stories in Matthew and Luke, 594
Greenwood, John, see under *Barrowe and Greenwood*
Gregory VII, 56 n.
Guyon, Madam, 587

H

Hales, John, 409
Harnack, Adolf, 39 n., 163 n.
Harington, James, 396
Hartmann, Von, 95
Hatch's Bampton Lectures, 162, 168 n.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, 159
Hegesippus, 166–7
Helvetius, 335
Helwys, Thomas, 236
Hermas, 177
High Church, 124
Hilary of Poictiers, 233
Hippolytus, 192
Hobbes, Thomas, 148 n.
Holm, Adolf, 521 n.
Homer, 81
Hooker, R., 149 n., 222–6, 278, 409
Hort, F. J. A., 389
Howe, John, 107, 114, 276, 278
Hugo, of St. Victor, 56 n.
Hume, David, 281, 472 n.
Hyde, Lawrence, 112 n.

I

Ignatian Epistles, 178–81
Ignatius, 184 n.
Incarnation, 428–30
Independence, 111, 118–19, 144, 147–9 n., 214 n., 219 n., 221 n., 227, 412–13; its conception of religion in relation to the State, 229; its strength, the interpretation of religion, 230, 234; toleration, a creation of, 236–8; action of, on the State, 239–41
Individualism in Russia, 424
Intellect, modern, and Christianity, 87
Irenæus, 75, 180, 186

J

Jacob, Henry, 147 n., 219, 221 n., 235, 236
James, the Lord's brother, 164–7, 181, 572
Jerome, 405 n., 521 n.
Jerusalem, as scene of Jesus' ministry in third period, 287–8, 433–6; see under *Paul*.
Jesus, 8; His mission, 12, 107; the founding of the church, 132, 283–305; the Kingdom of God, 134, 169,

283; Jesus and Sacerdotalism, 158; the Priesthood of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 159; an impersonated moral law, 173; the ethics of, 175; as preacher, 277, 318–21; the obscurity of the life of, P 283–5; the three periods of the t ministry of, 286–8; the ministry in Prie alilee, 308–12; teaching in the 20 nagogue, 312–15; His exclusion Pri om the synagogues, 314; in controversy with the Pharisees, 315–18; the teaching of, in first period, 322–70; accused of being a revolutionary, 338–40; the moral authority of Jesus, 341–6, 370; philanthropy, the creation of, 348–51; on Fasting, 357; on Mammon-worship, 361–3; Jesus by nature no man of sorrows, 364–7; on the law of retaliation, 367–9; the teaching of Jesus in His middle period, 371–431; the parables of, 371–2; Peter's confession, 374–6; His idea of the church, 382 *seq.*; idea of church begins with, 388; His action in the church, 392; method of, in founding the church, 400–3; magnanimity of, 413; kingly function of, 421–3; as Redeemer and Judge, 430–1; the teaching of, in its third period—the death of Jesus, 432–68; His apocalyptic teaching, 444–5; the Last Supper, 446–7; attitude of Priests to, 448–53; the meaning of the cross to, 465–8; Jesus and Paul, 469–74, 478–81; John's interpretation of Jesus, as Son of God, 583–5

John, the Apostle, 107, 302–4, 577–91; John and Paul, 577–9; John and Peter, 579–81; John as friend and interpreter of Jesus, 581–5; characteristics of Fourth Gospel, 585; his mysticism and symbolism, 588; the prologue of the Fourth Gospel, 592–602; the history of Jesus as written by John, 602–9

John of Salisbury, 56 n.

John Mark, 504, 518, 520

Johnson, Francis, 218, 221 n.

Josephus, 164, 167

Judaism, 170–2, 175, 306, 335, 349, 438–40, 471, 487

Julian, 75

Justin Martyr, 75, 186, 193 n., 521 n.

Juvenal, 34, 75

K

Kant, 76

Kepler, 94

κηφᾶς, 377

Kingdom of God, 134, 326–36, 347–58; in its fundamental idea, 358–67; and its duties, 367–70; growing emphasis on the "kingdom" in second period of Jesus' teaching, 371; various usages of term in the Gospels, 371 n.

κλῆρος, 186

Knollys, Hanserd, 236

κυριακόν, 384, 390, 391

L

Lactantius, 233

Lambeth Articles, 209 n.

Laud, 111, 124

"Laymen," 204

Legarde, 470 n.

Leibniz, 76

Leo X, 58

Liberty, 422–8

Lightfoot's essay on the "Christian Ministry," 164, 168, 172; on the Episcopacy, 183 n.; on Clement of Rome, 189 n.

Locke, John, 149 n., 238

Loisy, 359

Lord's Supper, 276

Lucian, 38, 53, 75

Lucretius, 38, 81, 82, 87

Luther, 107, 145 n., 200, 277, 389, 409, 418

Lutheran Church, 411–13, 628

M

Maccabees, 291, 436, 443

Magistrate, his power and function, as conceived by Puritan and Separatist, 210

Marcus Aurelius, 34, 35, 53, 54, 75
Matthias the Apostle, 135
Mechanical Theory of Universe, 88, 94
Melville, Andrew, 102 n.
Mill, J. S.'s autobiography, 611–13
Milton, John, 5, 108, 113, 148 n., 153, 154, 230, 379, 396, 409, 421
Minister, the, 281–2, 417–18, 420
Miracles, Celsus and Renan on, 85
Missions of Christianity, 277
Morality and Religion, 170
More, Sir Thomas, 396, 406
Murton on Persecution, 236

N

Naturalism, 80, 81, 88
Nature, the physicist's view of, 402
Neander, 187
Newman, J. H., 278
New Testament, writers, 246; critical study of, 247–8; the various ways of studying critically, 249–52
Nonconformity, 5, 424; see under *Separatists*
Nye, Philip, 236

O

Origen, 75, 406, 523 n., 187
Owen, John, 114

P

Paley, 335
Pantænus, 406
Pascal, 284
Pastoral Epistles, 132
Paul, 14, 22–4, 75, 107, 135, 161, 165; righteousness as conceived by Paul and Matthew, 359–60; Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, 469–502; the call of, 474–8, 489; religious environment of, in Tarsus, 481–4; in Jerusalem, 484–9, 496; Paul and Stephen, 488; in Arabia, 489; again, in Jerusalem, 490; in Tarsus, 492–3, 496; Barnabas and Paul, 494–5; his ministry in Antioch, 496–9; missionary journeys, 498, 506, 508–9, 518–24, 529–36; his mission to the Gentiles, 496–502, 506; Paul in Europe, 503–44; Paul and the Apostles at Jerusalem, 499–503; separation of Paul and Barnabas, 503–5; Paul and Silas, 506, 508; Paul in Asia Minor, 508–10, 518–2 the man of Macedonia, 512– Paul's love for the Jews, 514 attitude of the Jews to, 518–24, 534; his conception of Gent 525–27; in Athens, 530–33; Corinth, and the Epistles writte there, 533–7; Paul and Aquila, 533; characteristics, as revealed in the Epistles, 539–44; in Asia, and in prison, 545–76; in Ephesus, 546, 552–6; the controversy concerning Gentiles, 570–4; Paul and John, 577–9
Pauline Epistles, 42, 478–81, 535–44; to the Galatians, 521–4 n.; 1 Corinthians, 547–51 n.; 2 Corinthians, 556; Romans, 557–66; of the captivity, 575–6
Pearson, Bishop, 114
Pelagius, 407–8
Penry, John, 217, 220 n.
Pessimism, 95, 330
Peter the Apostle, 75, 107, 301, 356; his confession and its meaning, 374–82; meaning of "Thou art Peter," 377; Peter and John, 579–81
Πέτρος, 377
Peter the Lombard, 57
Pharisees, the, 287, 293–6, 438–40, 470, 485–6: their notion of the law, 307; their controversies with Jesus, 315–18, 319, 341–6; Christ's judgment of, 441
Pilate, 451
Plato, 34, 81, 145 n., 146 n., 327, 395
Pliny, the elder, 39, 75
Plotinus, 75, 407
Plutarch, 75
Polycarp, 75, 178
Polybius, 521 n.
Porphyry, 75

Preaching, 275–82; its effects in history, 277 *seq.*; preaching in Scotland, 278–81; the prophetic function of the Church, 418–21
Presbyterian Polity, 152, 210, 212, 412–13
Priest, 121, 133, 157, 187, 204; in the time of Christ, 289–93
Priesthood of all believers, 138, 188, 201, 227: of the Church, 416–18
Primitive Christianity, 161, 168, 177, 497
Providence of God, 129–30
Psalm, eighty-fourth, the, interpretation of, 254–7
Puritan idea of Church, 130–1
Puritanism, 109–41; the New, 118, 136
Puritans, Whitgift on, 208; as distinguished from Anglican and Separatist, 209–12
Pusey, E. B., 405

R

Ramsay, Sir W. M., 41 n., 521 n.
Rationalism in eighteenth century, 60
Reason and Revelation, 89, 610–28
Reformation, 58, 206–7, 278; see *Religion of Christ*
Reformers, Continental and English, 205
Regulative principles of Christianity, 99
Religion of Christ and Ecclesiastical Polity, 142–75
— and Catholicism, 176–204
— and the Reformation, 205–41
Renaissance, 80
Renan, 37 n., 38 n., 85, 87, 101
Restoration, the Church of, 112–16
Resurrection of Jesus, 85, 431, 451, 590
Revolution, the (in England), 115
Ritschl, 167 n., 187
Robinson, John, 218, 221 n., 235, 236
Roman Church, 6, 101, 104, 151, 157, 170, 229, 379–82, 411–12, 628
— Empire, 32; its ethics and religion, 34
Rome and modern England, 70

S

Sacerdotalism, 109–41, 186, 201; the New Sacerdotalism, 118; evangelical purpose in revival of, 125; criticism of, 126, 176
Sacraments, 110, 121, 130, 201
Sadducees, the, 287, 289–93, 341, 438–42, 486
Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln, 209 n.
Schelling, 403
Schmeidel, 516 n,
Schopenhauer, 330
Science and Religion, 73, 90, 91
Science, modern, 82
Scotch preachers, 278–81
Secularism, 99
Seeley, Sir J. R., 89
Selden, 148 n.
Seneca, 34, 75, 534, 567
Separatists, 208, 212–22
Sermon on the Mount, 308, 314, 322–70, 440
— 1st Session: The Beatitudes, 326–36
— 2nd Session: The preservative and illuminative function of the disciples, 336–8
— 3rd Session: The authority of Jesus, 341–6
— 4th Session: The "kingdom" as an institution for worship of God, 347–58
Meaning of "righteousness" in sermon, 347–8
— 5th Session: The "kingdom" in its fundamental idea, 358–67
— 6th Session: The "kingdom" and its duties, 367–70
Sheldon, Archbishop, 114
Sidney, Algernon, 396
Sin and suffering, 455–7
Smith, Adam, 157, 472 n.
Smith, John, the Cambridge Platonist, 333
Smith, W. Robertson, 250 n.
Socrates, 146 n.
"Son of God," 374–6, 430, 473, 513
"Son of Man," 371, 430, 444, 513
South, Robert, 112 n., 114
Spencer, Herbert, 76, 83, 95

σπερμολόγος, 41 n.
Spinoza, 80, 327
Statius, 534
Strabo, 38, 521 n.
Strauss, 87, 249
συναγωγή, 145 n.

T

Tacitus, 68, 71, 75.
Tauler, 58, 587
Taylor, Jeremy, 238, 265, 278
Temple, Jewish, contrasted with Christian Church, 258
Tennyson and Christianity, 72
Tertullian, 54, 75, 185, 190–2, 232, 234, 405
Theistic view of universe, 88
Thomas the Apostle, 607
Timothy, 522–4, 534, 543
Toleration, in England, 150, 235–8; Lecky on, 231
Tolstoi, 424
Tübingen School, 442, 517 n.

U

Universe, mechanical theory of, 88, 94; theistic view of, 88
Unknowable, the, 84

V

Varro, 37
Version, Authorised, 348
Version, Revised, 347
Virgil, 39 n.
Voltaire, 76, 467

W

Walker, Clement, 148 n.
Watson, E. W., Professor, 193 n.
Watts, Isaac, 278, 391 n.
Wellhausen, 377 n., 378 n., 387, 392 n., 442, 525 n.
Wesley, John, 278, 410
Whitfield, George, 278
Whitgift, Archbishop, 207, 208, 209 n., 211, 218 n., 219 n.
Williams, Roger, 236
Worldliness, 268
Worship, 253–82; praise, 271–3; prayer, 273–5; preaching, 275–82

Z

Zeitgeist, the problems of, 67, 79, 86
Zwingli, 277, 278

ANDREW MARTIN FAIRBAIRN'S

The Philosophy of the Christian Religion

Cloth, 8vo, $3.50 net

"The most important book of its kind that has appeared for years. Dr. Fairbairn is unquestionably one of the most masterful thinkers of the time. . . . He is at the same time intensely modern. He understands exceptionally well the points at which the most vital problems in present-day thought have arrived, and so he discerns keenly the points where the fundamental question of philosophy, science, and religion meet. Dr. Fairbairn's discussion is equally at home in statement and elucidation. The style, moreover, is the perfect counterpart of the thinking. There is not a bit of that labored yet sluggish, half-done thinking that sticks in the big words of a stereotyped technical terminology. Simpler, purer, better English can hardly be found than appears on almost every page of this book. In other words, the author thinks to a finish." — *Chicago Tribune.*

"The broad basis laid for inductive reasoning, and the characteristic attractions of the writer's philosophic method and graphic style, contribute to form in this volume a massive and brilliant plea for the historic faith of the church." — *The Outlook.*

"This work is one of the strongest and best published within the last ten years in English in the department commonly known as Apologetics. Its primary object is two-fold: first, to explain religion through nature and man, conceiving of it as a joint product of the mind within man and of the nature around him. . . . The second part of the author's design is to construe Christianity, through religion, to explain its origin and nature and indicate its distinctive ideas. . . . This is a book not simply to be read for the interest of its topic, but to be studied with care and enjoyed as a rare contribution to the philosophy of religion — the work of a master mind; and Dr. Fairbairn puts himself, through its publication, easily at the head of the theologians that use the English language." — *Interior.*

"There is one supreme qualification which Dr. Fairbairn has, for dealing with his great subject, namely, the perhaps unrivaled range of his knowledge in the fields of philosophy, theology, history, and religions and the breadth and sympathy of his power of historical generalization. His generalizations . . . are always felt to be large, luminous, and instructive — formed in full view of the world of facts to be interpreted." — *Living Age.*

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York

BOOKS OF RELATED INTEREST

By FRANCIS G. PEABODY

Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University

The Approach to the Social Question

An Introduction to the Study of Social Ethics. *Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net*

Jesus Christ and the Christian Character

An examination of the teaching of Jesus in its relation to some of the moral problems of personal life. *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net*

Jesus Christ and the Social Question

An examination of the teaching of Jesus in its relation to some problems of modern social life. *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net*

The Religion of an Educated Man

Religion as Education — Christ's Message to the Scholar — Knowledge and Service. *Cloth, 12mo, $1.00 net*

By the Rev. WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH

Professor of Church History in Rochester Theological Seminary

Christianity and the Social Crisis

Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net

By CARL HILTY

Professor in the University of Bern, Switzerland

Happiness

Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net

The Steps of Life

Further Essays on Happiness

Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net

By NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS

The Quest of Happiness

Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net

By R. J. CAMPBELL

Minister of The City Temple, London

The New Theology

Cloth, 8vo, $1.50 net

By W. H. P. FAUNCE

President of Brown University

The Educational Ideal in the Ministry

Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64–66 Fifth Avenue, New York

BOOKS OF RELATED INTEREST *Continued*

BY HENRY S. NASH

Ethics and Revelation — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net*

The Atoning Life — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.00 net*

BY DR. LYMAN ABBOTT

The Great Companion — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.00*

The Other Room — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.00*

The Temple — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net*

BY ROBERT M. WENLEY

Modern Thought and the Crisis in Belief — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net*

BY THE RT. REV. CHARLES D. WILLIAMS

A Valid Christianity for To-day — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net*

BY DR. ARTHUR S. HOYT

The Preacher: His Person, Message, and Method
By the author of "The Work of Preaching" — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net*

BY HENRY C. KING
President of Oberlin College

The Laws of Friendship, Human and Divine — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net*

The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net*

Personal and Ideal Elements in Education — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net*

Reconstruction in Theology — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net*

Theology and the Social Consciousness — *Cloth, 8vo, $1.25 net*

Rational Living — *Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net*

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York

NEW BOOKS OF RELIGIOUS INTEREST

By J. J. M. De GROOT, Ph.D.

Professor of Ethnography in the University of Leyden, Holland

The Religion of the Chinese *Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net*

These lectures were delivered at Hartford Theological Seminary, primarily to give students preparing for foreign missionary work the essential knowledge of the religious history, beliefs, and customs of a people among whom they may labor. China and the Chinese have always been an almost impenetrable puzzle to the Occidental mind, and for many years no attempt has been made to reach even the simplest understanding of the real Orient. To-day it is impossible for Europe and America to ignore longer the millions of people in Eastern Asia. Dr. De Groot's careful analysis of their religion is one of the first and most useful steps to some understanding of the Chinese.

By HORACE G. UNDERWOOD

The Religions of Eastern Asia *Cloth, 12mo, Ready*

A careful study of the religions of the many millions of Asiatics. Covering a somewhat wider field than Dr. De Groot, Mr. Underwood has stated very clearly, not only the faith of the Chinese, but the fundamental principles of Shintoism and the Japanese and Chinese forms of Buddhism as well as a discussion of Korean beliefs. It is hardly necessary to point out again how absolutely essential a knowledge of the religion of a race is to any intelligent understanding of the country, the history, or the aims of a nation.

By SAMUEL G. SMITH, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D.

Head Professor of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology in the University of Minnesota, and also for many years a teacher of the Bible to classes in the People's Church, Saint Paul.

Religion in the Making A Study in Biblical Sociology *Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net*

Here Dr. Smith turns from the present to the remote past and shows us the making of religion among the people of Israel. This book admirably assists the man of to-day to visualize the life of the centuries when the Bible was being written.

By Professor IRVING KING

Of the University of Iowa

The Development of Religion *Cloth, 12mo*

Professor King does not believe that religion sprang fully developed into the mind of man. The growth of our conception of God is a study, which in the author's skillful hand becomes of intense interest not only to the scientist but to the reader interested in all phases of human nature. Although dealing with what in one sense is a purely scientific question, Professor King has carefully kept his work free from technicalities, unintelligible to any but the specialists. In consequence he has written a book which is certain to stimulate serious thought on one of the great questions that confronts us.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York